



...: emergency needs assessment branch

**Desk Review:
The effects of Food Aid
on Household Migration
Patterns and
Implications for
Emergency Food
Assessments**

*Overseas Development
Institute*

**Strengthening Emergency Needs
Assessment Capacity (SENAC)**

November 2005

The effects of food aid on household migration patterns and implications for emergency food assessments

Prepared by: *Laura Hammond, Jennifer Bush, Kevin Savage and Paul Harvey - Food Economy Group and Overseas Development Institute*

November, 2005

© World Food Programme, Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN)

This study was prepared under the umbrella of the “Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Capacity” (SENAC) project. The SENAC project aims to reinforce WFP’s capacity to assess humanitarian needs in the food sector during emergencies and the immediate aftermath through accurate and impartial needs assessments.

Views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view or policies of WFP.

United Nations World Food Programme

Headquarters: Via C.G. Viola 68, Parco de’ Medici, 00148, Rome, Italy

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

The effects of food aid on household migration patterns and implications for emergency food assessments

November 2005

Acknowledgements

This report was commissioned by the World Food Programme (WFP) in response to a recommendation by the SENAC project (Strengthening Needs Assessment Capacity in WFP) to review analytical methods and assessment tools pertaining to the effects of food aid on dependency and induced migration. In the process of researching the report, the authors benefited from discussions with a large number of practitioners involved in food security assessment, early warning and emergency assistance programming. A full list of those contacted is provided at the end of the report. We would like to thank everyone who gave their time and insights, shared documents and provided feedback on the ideas contained in this document. The authors would also like to thank Agnès Dhur of the WFP's Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN) for her guidance on the overall project, and for comments on an earlier draft of this document. We would also like to thank our colleagues in the Food Economy Group and Overseas Development Institute for their comments. Any errors of fact or in the representation of interviewees' viewpoints are, of course, the sole responsibility of the authors.

Content

Executive Summary	10
1. Introduction	14
1.1 Intended audience and users.....	15
1.2 Methodology and limitations	15
2. Migration, livelihoods and food aid: an overview	16
2.1 Understanding migration and its role in developing countries	16
2.2 Understanding migration during crisis	19
2.2.1 Migration or displacement?	19
2.2.2 Coping with crisis	20
2.2.3 The political economy of migration and displacement.....	22
2.2.4 Law and principles.....	23
2.2.5 Impact of relief assistance on migration	24
2.3 Migration-sensitive assessments	25
2.3.1 Analytical frameworks.....	25
2.3.2 Assessing migration.....	26
2.4 Gender and age dimensions of migration decisions	28
2.5 Categorisations and groupings	28
2.6 Migration and programming	30
2.6.1 Where?.....	30
2.6.2 What?	31
3. Guidelines for emergency food security assessment incorporating migration	33
3.1 Introduction	33
3.2 The analytical framework of the WFP EFSA Handbook.....	33
3.3 Proposed methodology.....	34
3.4 Assessment checklist	35
3.5 Assessment tools, methods and process	42
3.6 Protocol for field testing	43
4. Conclusion	44
Bibliography	45
List of interviewees	48

Executive Summary

Many of the people that the World Food Programme (WFP) assists in its emergency programmes have migrated as a result of a natural or human-made disaster. This report examines migration as it is practiced by people not only as a result of a crisis, but also as a strategy to reduce vulnerability and maximise income prior to or during a crisis. It proposes guidelines for assessing the role of migration as part of WFP's emergency food security assessments (EFSAs), and discusses the programming implications of incorporating migration-sensitive analysis into emergency assessments.

Overview

General analyses of migration are often presented in negative terms. Policy-makers especially typically assume that rural populations are sedentary agriculturalists, and that migration signifies a breakdown in the rural economy.

Recently, however, there has been growing appreciation of the key part migration can play in rural livelihoods. Rather than an interruption to a longstanding way of life or a forced response to an unusual event, many forms of migration are typical features of poor people's lives. Through migration, households may increase the value of their livestock assets, or they may diversify their income by obtaining access to employment, engaging in trade or obtaining assistance from government or relief and development agencies.

In the context of food security assessments, understanding migration's role in a household's overall income is crucial. Without such understanding, it is difficult for development planners and food security analysts to appreciate the different components that make up the income of mobile households.

In seeking to understand the role of migration within a household, it is important to find out:

- who migrates;
- where they migrate to;
- when and how often they migrate; and
- the contribution migration makes to the household's budget.

Understanding migration during crisis

While people commonly use migration as part of their normal livelihood strategies, crises can cause major changes. As people seek to protect or recover their assets, or to gain protection or security, they may choose new migration routes, or alter their traditional migratory practices.

A sudden-impact natural disaster can cause people to flee from their homes quickly, often taking few belongings with them. A slow-onset disaster can cause people to move to protect their assets, or to find supplementary forms of support if they have lost their principal means of subsistence. In conflicts, the primary motivation is often to find areas of greater safety and security.

During conflicts, control of civilian movements can be a tool of war; in natural disasters, it may also be a factor. Understanding the interests of all stakeholders, including local and international governments and aid agencies, is crucial to making informed recommendations so that assistance respects the legitimate interests of governments, as well as the requirements of international humanitarian and human rights law. Principles of accountability, participation, transparency and informed choice for beneficiaries should also inform programming.

The impact of relief assistance on migration

Assessments need to maintain a realistic view of the relative importance of relief aid to people's overall survival strategies during emergencies. Where people are forced into distress migration, the availability of food aid may well be a considerable factor in influencing their decision to move, and the presence of food aid in home areas may encourage migrants or displaced people to return. Food aid can also play a role in enabling people to remain in their home areas throughout a crisis.

At the same time, however, access to employment, natural resources, other sources of income, protection, safety and security can be as significant as material assistance in influencing migration decisions. Uncertainty surrounding the amount and timing of aid deliveries, poor or opaque targeting, the widespread sharing of relief entitlements and diversion of relief by local elites all lessen the impact of aid on crisis-affected livelihoods. There is therefore a need for caution in assuming that food aid plays a dominant role in influencing migration decisions. Rather, it should be seen as one of many potential influences.

Emergency assessments

Emergency assessment procedures and assistance policies usually do not consider the role of migration explicitly, either as an important contributor to food security in non-crisis times, or as a coping strategy when disaster strikes. This means that migration can easily be overlooked in favour of more tangible elements of livelihoods, such as agricultural production. Likewise, assessments of displacement and disasters are often limited to considering losses in the area that has suffered physical damage.

Assessments need to widen their scope to consider the possibility that the affected population may not live only within the area geographically affected by crisis. A migration-sensitive assessment would also need to take account of the context-specific age and gender dimensions of migration. Good analysis of gender and age issues is important in understanding the vulnerabilities and capacities of those who remain behind, and those who migrate.

Assessments also need to include the host population, as well as migrants. When disaster strikes and people migrate or are displaced from their homes, many seek refuge among local communities rather than in camps, drawing on social networks for support. Over time, the burden of providing for migrant guests may be a significant strain on hosts' resources. An assessment of the needs of local host communities may suggest a case for outside assistance.

People's situations are fluid and hard to label. A host today may be a displaced migrant tomorrow. The point is not to be limited by categories – pastoralist; labour migrant; refugee;

internally displaced – to a narrow understanding of who is affected, but to keep the assessment broad enough to capture the full extent of the crisis.

Migration and programming

Understanding migration, mobility and displacement should inform how assistance is delivered, where and when, and the appropriate balance between food aid and other responses. Assistance offered in areas far away from people's territory or area of origin, frequently or unpredictably and in small quantities, may prevent people from returning to their home areas between distribution periods. In some cases, distribution centres may be established relatively close at hand, but affected people are unable to take advantage of assistance because the centre lies within another group's area, to which they do not have access.

An understanding of migration should also influence the type of assistance provided. For example, the bulkiness of food aid may mean that cash or vouchers are more appropriate for mobile populations. Responses to crises in pastoralist areas might include fodder and water provision to maintain livestock herds. Where remittances are important, people could be assisted in re-establishing contact with relatives through family tracing, or communications facilities could be made available.

Food for work has particularly important implications for migration because it significantly restricts mobility. Traditionally, food for work has been provided in the agricultural off-season, but this may be precisely when particular forms of migration play a key role in livelihood strategies. Further considerations include how far people must travel to take part. A wider view of livelihoods may suggest other possibilities for the type of work chosen; in place of the traditional focus on restoring or increasing agricultural productivity, for example, projects could be developed to promote small towns as marketing nodes.

Incorporating migration into emergency food security assessment: some guidelines

The WFP *Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook* describes the general assessment process. The assessment guidelines proposed in this report do not represent a departure from this approach. Instead, they use a set of question checklists that ensure that migration is an explicit part of the assessment. A brief description is given below; the guidelines are elaborated in more detail in the full report (see pp. 29–41).

The proposed methodology comprises three steps:

- understanding pre-crisis migration patterns;
- assessing the impact of a crisis on migration patterns; and
- assessing the impact of assistance on migration choices.

1. Understanding pre-crisis migration patterns

Key questions here include:

- What types of migration feature as essential aspects of livelihoods in non-crisis times?
- Who usually migrates?
- When do they go?

- Where do they go?
- How long do they stay away?
- How much of the household's income comes from migration?

2. Assessing the impact of a crisis on migration patterns

Key questions here include:

- Have there been any changes in the essential characteristics of pre-crisis migration patterns as a response to the crisis?
- Do people have assets to protect/preserve in their areas of origin, or are they bringing whatever they still have with them when they migrate?
- What factors are preventing people from returning to their areas of origin, or resuming their normal migration patterns?
- Are people able to support themselves adequately through these altered migration patterns?
- What specific new or heightened risks or vulnerabilities have arisen from displacement or migration?
- Why have the displaced chosen to migrate to this location?
- Are the displaced completely dependent on assistance, or are they able to practice some of their original livelihood strategies?
- What is the food security situation of the host population?

3. Assessing the impact of assistance on migration patterns

Key questions here include:

- How significant are levels of assistance likely to be?
- Is assistance likely to influence patterns of movement and displacement?
- If local residents are moving into the area where the displaced are receiving assistance, what are their reasons for doing so?
- Where should aid be delivered in order to enable people to maintain constructive livelihood and coping strategies?
- Are there migration-related issues that should be taken into account in deciding the frequency of distributions?
- If families have been separated during the crisis, what assistance can be offered to reunify them?

Conclusion

Despite the importance of migration to people's livelihoods, migration issues are not adequately covered by established emergency food security assessment guidelines. The guidelines proposed in this report provide a platform for refining WFP EFSA's so that they become more migration-sensitive, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of WFP's work. Migration-sensitive assessments can help to inform the programming of emergency assistance so that it builds on people's own coping strategies, safeguarding positive migration practices and helping people to avoid resorting to distress migration or displacement.

1. Introduction

Many of the people that the World Food Programme (WFP) assists in its emergency programmes have migrated as a result of a natural or human-made disaster. Often, the objectives of food aid programmes have been framed around the objective of preventing distress migration or responding to the food aid needs of populations that have already been displaced. It is also increasingly being recognised that migration already plays an important role in the normal livelihoods of people, as well as during crisis.

This paper examines migration as it is practiced by people not only as a result of a crisis, but also as a strategy to reduce vulnerability and to maximise income prior to or during a crisis. In some cases, households or individuals may decide to migrate to areas where they can obtain employment, natural resources or other sources of income to help reduce the impact of the crisis. In others, people may decide to migrate to places where food aid or another type of assistance is available. Often, migration is as much about finding protection, safety and security as it is about taking advantage of available assistance. Access to food aid or other forms of assistance is seldom the only determinant in people's decisions about where to move during crisis, and it is important that assessments maintain a realistic view of the relative importance of relief aid within the survival strategies of disaster-affected populations.

A better understanding of the role that migration plays both before and during crises should therefore be a critical part of emergency assessment, but it is an aspect of people's livelihoods that has often been neglected, or seen in negative terms as something to be avoided. As migration, and the income and access to food that arise from it, make up a crucial part of how people survive, it is vital that assessments do a better job of capturing this aspect of livelihoods. This paper argues that there are, broadly speaking, three aspects that all good emergency assessments should consider:

- understanding the role of migration in livelihoods before a crisis;
- analysis of the effects of a disaster on migration patterns, including new forms of distress migration and displacement; and
- analysis of what shifting migration patterns imply for emergency assistance, particularly for where assistance should be provided, how often and in what form.

Understanding the role that migration can play in the livelihoods of crisis-affected populations can help to inform the analysis during emergency food security assessments. The results of such assessments can improve targeting, and may also suggest forms or methods of providing assistance that can minimise disruption to livelihoods and help promote recovery. Such migration-sensitive programming might influence decisions about where relief should be provided, the type of relief that is needed and forms of complementarity between food aid and other forms of assistance.

After reviewing the issues relevant to people in pre-crisis and crisis situations, the paper proposes a protocol for assessing the role of migration as part of the recommended emergency food security assessment guidelines. The policy and programming implications of

incorporating migration-sensitive analysis into emergency assessments are discussed, and a proposal for applying this approach in several countries is proposed.

1.1 Intended audience and users

The intended audience of this review includes the staff of the WFP and its partners, including non-governmental organisations, host governments and donor agencies. The intended users are those who are involved in assessing needs and making recommendations for assistance interventions in emergencies; who are refining their general emergency assessment protocols (especially the guidelines outlined in the WFP Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook) and training others in assessment, such as ODAN staff members; as well as those who are developing country-specific emergency food security assessment protocols.

1.2 Methodology and limitations

As a desk review, this study is based on available literature (both published and unpublished) and interviews (conducted by email, telephone and – in the case of local interviewees – face-to-face) with WFP staff, key donors and aid agencies involved in food aid and livelihoods programming and emergency assessments.

There is very little published literature that specifically addresses the issue of the effects of food aid on migration patterns. This paper draws on literature around the role of migration in livelihoods in development contexts, the literature on coping strategies and livelihoods in crises, and a smaller body of literature on the impact and role of food aid in emergencies.

Efforts to learn from other assessment protocols have been hampered by the fact that few agencies currently explicitly include migration-related indicators in their emergency food security assessments. However, some methodologies, such as the household economy approach or other livelihoods-based systems, *implicitly* consider migration and the income that is derived from it in attempts to assess and quantify income and access to food. The concern of this review is that unless income sources arising from migration, such as remittances, are *explicitly* highlighted in emergency food security assessments and other emergency assessments in general, they are liable to be overlooked. The Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET) is in the process of incorporating migration considerations into its baseline assessments in many of the 16 countries in which it is working. WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) Unit, which analyses the causes of food insecurity and develops baseline information for policy-makers and programmers, considers the use of migration strategies by the food insecure, which may inform emergency assessments. However, the new Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook does not expressly discuss migration as a factor to be given specific attention. The paucity of emergency assessment procedures that explicitly consider migration may be treated as an opportunity for a coordinated approach for conducting such analysis, since many of the interviewees expressed an interest in using assessment methodologies that specifically incorporate migration into the analysis.

2. Migration, livelihoods and food aid: an overview

2.1 Understanding migration and its role in developing countries

Making generalisations about the relationship between migration, poverty and vulnerability is difficult since many of the connections are context-specific (McDowell and de Haan, 1997; Waddington and Sabates-Wheeler, 2003). Relationships between migration and variables such as poverty, levels of assets (land, livestock etc.), degree of access to resources such as labour or to social services and government support can be either positive or negative, and depend upon complex and historic factors in people's lives and social relationships.

General analyses of migration are broadly negative: impoverished agricultural people are being *pushed* away from their permanent homes by structures or circumstances – low labour productivity, asset destruction, market failures, disasters – beyond their control. The rural poor are pictured flooding into city slums, causing economic and social instability for themselves and the rest of the urban population. Perhaps because of these perceptions of negative outcomes, policy-makers, governments and donors have often seen the migration of the rural poor as being forced upon its hapless victims. This perspective assumes that rural populations are made up of sedentary agriculturalists, and that migration signifies a breakdown in the viability of rural economies. This has been the starting point for development models that have informed much policy and practice (De Haan, 2003). Despite substantial evidence to the contrary, what Farrington (1998) refers to as the 'yeoman farmer' fallacy persists, and is tied to what Ellis (2000) refers to as the 'small-farm first' paradigm. It is assumed that providing support to rural communities and small-farm agriculture will alleviate rural poverty, and thus stop the flow of out-migration.

This view of migration in development thinking is reflected in many Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). A study by the Sussex Centre for Migration Research (quoted in Black, 2004) examined 48 PRSPs, and found that 21 made no mention at all of migration; of the 27 that did, they did so mostly 'in negative or pejorative terms'. Seventeen presented internal migration as a problem for development, and eight cited a need to control and contain it. International migration also tends to be framed in negative terms, with Western governments in particular keen to limit it and to implement increasingly restrictive refugee policies (Harmer and Macrae, 2004).

In fact, rather than being an interruption to a longstanding way of life or a forced response to an unusual event, many forms of migration are typical features of poor people's livelihoods (DeHaan and Rogaly, 2004; Malkki, 1995). In many forms, people use mobility as a way of maintaining their livelihoods. The development literature has increasingly stressed the diversity of poor people's livelihoods (Ellis, 2000), and has recognised that the diverse portfolio of activities that make up livelihoods often includes migration and close links with urban areas (Tacoli, 2002). Deshingkar (2004) describes these as 'multi-locational livelihoods'. Diversification is a key means for households to reduce and manage risk, often when faced with shocks such as natural disasters or conflict. It is therefore important to recognise the complexity and variety of different types of migration. Migration may be seasonal, permanent or circular; it may take place between urban and rural areas, and may

occur within countries or across international borders. Migration patterns may also vary with gender or age: in some contexts, young men may be the primary migrants, while in others women may be more likely to migrate to find employment as domestic workers; in some cases, elderly people are more likely not to migrate (see Section 2.4).

Box 1: Labour migration out of Niger

In Niger, it is estimated that 30% to 40% of household incomes is derived from labour migration. In addition to the income benefits, households are able to subsist on the food they produce for longer because, with fewer members, their consumption needs are lower. Household economy analysis has shown that approximately 70% to 80% of poor households send at least one male member to find work outside the country (to Nigeria, Libya, Ghana, and Côte d'Ivoire) for four or five months. On average, monthly remittances amount to 5,000–10,000 CFA (\$9–18). However, in times of food insecurity, the length of the labour migration season may be extended. Labour migration that begins soon after the harvest season may be interpreted as a sign of significant food insecurity.

Source: OFDA DART Team (2005).

Recent development literature examines the importance of remittances as a source of external funding in many developing countries, and as a key part of individuals' livelihoods (Ratha, 2003). For most of the 1990s, remittance receipts exceeded international development assistance. Remittances have also been one of the least volatile sources of foreign exchange for developing countries. Migrants may increase remittances in times of economic hardship and economic downturns may encourage workers to migrate abroad.

The bias towards viewing societies as being at their best when they are sedentary extends to policies towards pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and cultivator groups. For these groups, seasonal migration is an essential feature of their livelihoods. In the context of food security assessments, understanding the role of migration in contributing to a household's overall income is crucial. Through migration, households may increase the value of their livestock assets, or they may diversify their income by obtaining access to employment (waged or occasional), engaging in trade, and sometimes obtaining assistance from government or relief and development agencies. Seasonal migration of this sort is typically not well understood or appreciated by governments, who find service delivery, taxation, census-taking and other administrative functions difficult to carry out among groups that are not sedentary. Without an understanding of when and where groups move, who within the group is likely to move first or last, and the conditions that might alter these migration patterns, it is difficult for development planners and food security analysts to appreciate the different components that make up the income of mobile households. As a result, the assistance provided to such communities often has limited effectiveness.

Avoiding a pejorative view of migration does not necessarily mean that it should be seen in solely positive terms. Migration often creates particular types of vulnerabilities, both for those on the move and for those left behind. For instance, a woman's decision to migrate to the nearest city to find employment to support her family may provide necessary resources to her household, but it may also expose her to commercial or sexual exploitation. An understanding of both the negative and positive aspects of migration may help to inform programming decisions about how to provide assistance in such a way that minimises the risks from migration, and works to preserve its positive contribution to livelihoods.

Box 2 identifies the essential elements of non-crisis livelihoods that are necessary to understand the use of migration as a resource maximisation or preservation strategy.

Box 2: What do we need to know about non-crisis migration patterns?

In determining the role of migration within a society or household, it is important to find out:

Who migrates?

In some situations, entire households may move together, while in others people travel individually. Young men who do not have farmland of their own may seek work as agricultural labourers or in commercial centres, and children with the most education may find employment as skilled workers. For instance, wealthy Somalis send their children to Europe and North America to gain an education so that they can support their family. Many women from the Horn of Africa, Bangladesh and Pakistan migrate to Gulf countries to find employment as domestic workers, and send money to their families back home.

Where do they migrate to?

The directions and destinations of migration are often predictable, since people tend to follow the same routes year after year, based on the benefits that migration is expected to bring, as well as on existing social networks. People often migrate to places where they have family or friends able to support them while they work, or who can help them to obtain employment (Deshingkar and Start, 2003; Stark and Bloom, 1985; Taylor, 1991).

When/how often do they migrate?

Pastoralists circulate through a known territory on a seasonal basis, bringing their animals closer to water during the dry season and going further away during the rainy season. Often, men migrate with the large stock (cattle or camels), while women and young children remain with the smaller animals (sheep and goats) closer to settled areas. The direction and frequency of pastoralist migration patterns can be predicted with some certainty; however, changes in natural resources (for example, the depletion of pastureland by overgrazing, drought or encroachment by agriculturalists, or water shortages caused by drought, or over settlement of areas close to water sources) or conflict with other ethnic groups may cause migration patterns to shift over time. Changing migration patterns in Niger contributed to the deepening of vulnerability to food insecurity, as pastoralists expanded their grazing territory into areas in the north of the country traditionally cultivated by agriculturalists.

Pastoralists are not the only people who migrate regularly to support their households. In Niger, poorer farmers regularly migrate out of their home areas to seek seasonal work. Because they do not invest as much in land or livestock, they have less to lose in times of drought. However, even small losses can be catastrophic for the poorest people, and when employment markets are affected by drought they may lose their jobs (FEWS NET Niger Profile, Jan 2005).

How much money does migration contribute to the household budget, and how often?

Ultimately, knowledge of migration patterns provides essential information on the composition of household income, which is essential in developing the baseline information for an EFSA in order to assess income gaps, target assistance and design appropriate programmes of livelihood support.

2.2 Understanding migration during crisis

The following section describes how crisis can lead to a change in migration patterns. As people seek to protect or recover their assets, or to gain protection or security, they may choose new migration routes, or alter their traditional migratory practices. In some cases, the availability of assistance may influence decisions to move, or the direction in which people go. The section considers these decisions, and suggests ways that assessment and programming should consider migration during crisis.

2.2.1 Migration or displacement?

The previous section has described how people commonly use migration as part of their normal livelihood strategies. These strategies change according to the nature of the crisis. A sudden-impact natural disaster, such as a flood, tsunami, earthquake or volcanic eruption, can cause people to flee from their homes quickly, often taking few belongings with them. A slow-onset disaster – a drought, famine or escalating conflict – can cause people to move to save their lives, to protect the assets that they still have, or to find supplementary forms of support after having lost their principal means of subsistence. In conflicts, the primary motivation is often to find an area of relative safety and security. In many complex emergencies, the nature of the crisis and the reasons for people moving can be a mixture of all these things.

Such complexity of causes and reasons for people to move during crises cause considerable confusion when discussing and analysing migration. A wide range of overlapping terms exist to describe various types of movement: voluntary migration, involuntary migration, forced migration, distress migration, exodus, forced displacement and displacement. For the purposes of this review, it is sufficient to clearly distinguish between two terms (and their derivatives): migration and displacement.

1. Migration (and migrants). Migration is a strategy for coping with livelihood stress, or for protecting, maintaining or improving people's livelihoods through increased accumulation or diversified or improved income. It may be pursued seasonally, periodically or permanently by some members of a household.
2. Displacement (and displaced people). Displacement is a survival tactic employed in reaction to disaster or imminent threat, e.g. unexpected floods or military invasion. Used in this way, it includes forced or involuntary migration, and distress migration.

The distinction between migration and displacement is less a matter of cause or physical characteristic than a matter of people's motivations. Extreme examples may be easy to differentiate, but often it is difficult to differentiate between migration and displacement. For example, a population may be able to cope with a difficult period or mild shock for some time by *migrating* in search of employment. As the shock effects worsen, or as assets are depleted, people may begin to move, not as part of a sustainable livelihood strategy, but rather as a last resort in order to survive; now, they are being *displaced* by a situation that has become a disaster for them. An example of a population experiencing increasing livelihood stress, where some people change migration patterns progressively to cope while others become displaced, is given in the Box 3.

Box 3: A typology of migration patterns in Darfur and how they change in a crisis

North–south migration of farmers

Farmers from North Darfur migrate south to open up new farms in South Darfur. Undertaken by wealthier farmers because resettlement involves higher risks. Due to risks, resettlement slows during a crisis.

North–south migration of pastoralists

Pastoralists from North Darfur migrate south in search of new pastures in South Darfur. Increases during pasture droughts but does not directly indicate a famine.

Labour migration into local towns

Two types of migration:

- (i) Seasonal: poor farmers migrate into towns in search of temporary employment. This migration flow increases in famine periods, but it is a late indicator.
- (ii) Permanent: permanent migration is a risky venture. Hence it is a very late indicator of famine.

Abandonment of villages

Villagers who abandon their homes do so only under severe duress, such as during a severe drought when local water supplies dry up.

North–south migration of labour

Increased flows of migrant labourers from North Darfur to South Darfur is an early indicator of drought, but not necessarily of famine.

North–east/central migration of labour

This type of migration is risky because it involves long-distance travel, and hence it often slows during droughts.

Wanderings of the destitute

Anecdotal evidence of increased movement of the destitute occurs, but factual evidence is usually non-existent.

Source: de Waal (2004).

2.2.2 Coping with crisis

While it is well documented that migration can be a coping strategy for people experiencing livelihood stress, it is not possible to generalise about the precise motivating factors that compel people to move, and the timing of their decision. Corbett (1988) shows how migration features among a range of both early and late-term strategies to save lives and livelihoods (see Box 4).

Box 4: Potential coping strategies during famine

Stage 1: Insurance mechanisms

- Changes in cropping and planting practices
- Sale of small stock
- Reduction of consumption levels
- Collection of wild foods
- Use of inter-household transfers and loans

Increased petty commodity production
Migration in search of employment
Sale of possessions (e.g., jewellery)

Stage 2: Disposal of productive assets

Sale of livestock (e.g., oxen)
Sale of agricultural tools
Sale or mortgaging of land
Credit from merchants and moneylenders
Reduction of current consumption levels

Stage 3: Destitution

Distress migration

Source: Corbett (1988).

In some societies, people choose to migrate only as a last resort when all assets have been liquidated; in others migration is done sooner, to protect assets before they are lost. In response to sudden-impact disasters, whole households usually move as a unit if they are together when the crisis occurs. During slow-onset disasters, pastoralist households often split up as a medium-term strategy, with women and children migrating in search of employment to urban areas or to areas where relief assistance is available, while men migrate with herds to dry-season grazing areas in order to protect their remaining livestock. When the crisis becomes more severe, women and children tend to seek assistance in camps before men, since they are most severely affected and are separated from what remains of their herds.

In Ethiopia, Pankhurst and Bevan (2004) interviewed people in 20 locations across the four most populous regions of the country on a range of issues, including how they experienced famine. They found that migration was one of the main work-related strategies for coping with hunger. This included rural and urban migration, seasonal and daily wage labour; work on state and private farms and hiring out children as herders or domestic servants. Seasonal labour migration for harvesting and coffee picking is a normal strategy, but one that intensifies under famine conditions. The worse the crisis the further people tended to move, notably to towns. Old people were felt to be particularly vulnerable during famines because of their inability to move around looking for food or work. This finding is echoed by Ellis and Woldehanna (2005), who found that higher rates of mobility in Ethiopia corresponded with lower rates of poverty.

As noted above, those who migrate to obtain access to essential household resources, the decision to move may occupy a grey area between being voluntary and being forced. A crisis that makes it impossible for a community to remain in their homes (such as a tsunami, earthquake or armed attack) may leave people with no choice but to move. However, where people move to, who they settle with, and how long they remain away from their homes are decisions that, even in the context of forced migration, are often made based in anticipation of maximising the possible livelihood support strategies available.

The fact that people sometimes choose to migrate as a medium-term strategy rather than a last-ditch effort to save their lives highlights the fact that migration is rarely ever purely voluntary or involuntary. Instead, migration decisions tend to be made when there is a significant push factor that makes remaining in place impractical or impossible, while at the same time there are pull factors that make migrating an attractive opportunity, or which may influence the direction and duration of displacement. People who move in the early stages of a crisis tend to be in a better position to gauge where to migrate. They are more likely to be able to establish themselves outside of a camp, and to use what assets they still have to generate income once they have migrated. Similarly, those who migrate individually and in small groups also tend to have more power to make decisions about their migration than those who are swept up in large groups on the move. Migration decisions are often influenced by the need to find safety and protection. This is obviously particularly true in contexts of conflict-related displacement. In a study examining the livelihoods of war-affected in Bosnia, Stites and Lautze (2005) found that the ability to find relative safety was of crucial importance in ensuring better livelihood security. The need for protection also applies in displacement as a result of natural disasters. Migration-sensitive assessment may therefore need to cover protection as well as food security issues.

Crisis can inhibit migration, as well as cause it. When natural disasters render people incapable of moving, as when floods wash away access roads, earthquakes destroy infrastructure or conflict prevents traders from bringing goods to markets, local livelihoods are disrupted. In Darfur, Young et al. (2005) found that 'limited mobility resulting from insecurity has seriously limited the core livelihood strategies of all groups in Darfur, including cultivation; seasonal livestock migration; trade and access to markets for buyers and sellers; labour migration and remittances; and travel to rural areas for the collection of firewood, fodder and wild foods'.

2.2.3 The political economy of migration and displacement

Migration is always a sensitive political issue, both nationally and internationally. Better analysis of the role of migration in crises therefore implies not only an understanding of the contribution made by migration within livelihoods, but an analysis of the political economy of migration and the political interests of different actors in controlling the movement of populations (Collinson, 2003; Macrae and Zwi, 1994).

The politics of migration are often clearest during conflicts where control of civilian movements can be used as a tool of war. Counter-insurgency tactics often include restrictions on the movement of civilians (Burundi and northern Uganda are recent examples). International actors often have an interest in trying to minimise refugee flows during crises, in part because of fears about increased numbers of asylum-seekers. During the 2001–2002 coalition action in Afghanistan, the borders were effectively sealed to prevent further refugee flows. But control of population movements may also be a factor in crises labelled natural disasters, and an analysis of the political economy of natural disasters is still important (Buchanan-Smith and Christophos, 2004). For instance, in Ethiopia's government-sponsored resettlement programme the poorest are expected to 'volunteer' to move to resettlement sites (Lind & Jalleta, 2005; Hammond and Dessalegn, 2004).

The politics of migration often present difficult dilemmas for humanitarian actors. Agencies in Burundi, for instance, have had to decide what aid it is appropriate to provide in

regroupement camps, and have had to balance the humanitarian imperative to alleviate suffering with concerns that aid might support a government strategy that breaches basic human rights (IASC, 2000).

Even in peacetime, large flows of migrants tend to make governments nervous. The fear is that they will destabilise the political landscape, posing a threat to the government; that they will overburden social services; or that they will take away jobs and other resources from the permanent local population. Government officials may fear that the more ‘comfortable’ migrants are in their temporary homes, the less likely they will be to return to their areas of origin. Migrants are thus often subject to restrictions on employment, ownership of property, access to education, health and water services and mobility. These constraints undermine people’s livelihood strategies, and make them even more dependent upon whatever emergency assistance might be available to them (Crisp 2004; Crisp & Jacobsen, 1998).

Other political factors and interests may influence these decisions. Governments may want to keep people from migrating into urban areas, or may wish to keep those who are politically opposed to them away from the rest of the population. Despite a multitude of evidence that shows that assisting people in camps exposes them to public health, psychological and sometimes security risks, governments often prefer to assist people in such settlements in order to better control migrants and to keep them separated from the local population. Moreover, camps are highly visible and can be effective tools for attracting aid resources. Camp residents are usually unable to exercise their rights to freedom of movement, property, education and employment (see OCHA (1998)). Humanitarian aid actors themselves, even when in theory favouring solutions such as local integration, often also find camps convenient (Verdirame and Harrell-Bond, 1986).

Analysis of the political economy of crises has increasingly been recognised as a crucial component of assessment, although the politics of disasters often remains ignored in practice (Collinson, 2003). Within political economy analysis, an understanding of the politics of migration and the interests of all the stakeholders, including local and international governments and aid agencies, is often crucial to making informed recommendations about where, how and to whom assistance can be provided such that it respects the legitimate interests of governments, and international humanitarian and human rights law, including refugee conventions (Age, 2005; Burke and Afman, 2005).

2.2.4 Law and principles

In assessing migration and recommending programming choices, it is vital that humanitarian actors are familiar with and respect key aspects of international humanitarian and human rights law. These commit states to respecting the right to flee persecution and claim asylum through the refugee conventions and the principle of non-*réfoulement*. The core humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence should also inform thinking about migration. Humanitarian actors have a responsibility to respond to the humanitarian imperative solely according to need, regardless of where those needs arise. As the Red Cross/NGO Code of Conduct states: ‘aid should not be used to further a particular political or religious standpoint’ (SCHR, 1998), which would include political actors attempting to use humanitarian aid to further political objectives around the control of population movements.

Basic principles of downward accountability, participation, transparency and informed choice for beneficiaries should also inform programming. People should not be forced to stay, move or congregate in camps. Rather, their decisions about where and when to move should be respected and protected. Beneficiaries should be encouraged to participate in decision-making about where and how aid should be distributed so as to respect their protection and dignity needs, and to enable them to pursue non-erosive coping strategies and to resume productive livelihoods as quickly as possible. Agencies are already committed to many of these principles through the Code of Conduct, the Sphere standards or the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International (SCHR, 1994; Sphere Project, 2004; HAPI, 2005). The challenge has been living up to commitments to participation and greater downward accountability in practice (ALNAP Global Study, 2003).

2.2.5 Impact of relief assistance on migration

There is a perception, prevalent in the aid community, that food aid has a significant effect on migration choices during emergencies. As both food aid and the income derived from migration can provide essential resources to the crisis-affected, it might be assumed that obtaining food aid is often an objective of migration. This belief has its origin in common understandings of African famines during droughts. In such cases, distress migration (displacement) is often a final survival strategy undertaken to obtain relief aid being distributed at central points or in camps, where people are gathered en masse. Hence, relief aid is seen to encourage people to gather in camps around distribution points (a salient example is the Ethiopia famine in the 1980s). DeWaal (1997) points to the fact that, in famines, epidemics have often been responsible for the bulk of mortality and that aid, by forcing people to congregate in camps, could increase the risk. This ‘health crisis’ model of famine mortality forms the basis of much of the concern around induced migration.

Actual correlations between food aid and migration are rarely completely causal; a host of other factors influence people’s decisions about where and when to move. Migration can be one of a number of strategies to reduce vulnerability and maximise income in anticipation of emergencies or crises. Households or individuals may decide to migrate to areas where they expect – on the basis of past experience or information circulating at the moment – to be able to obtain access to employment, natural resources or other sources of income to help reduce the impact of the crisis. People may also decide to migrate to places where they believe that there will be greater protection, safety and security. These issues are usually as significant, if not more so, than the availability of material assistance. Access to food aid or other forms of assistance is seldom the only determinant in people’s decisions about where to move during crises: it is important that assessments maintain a realistic view of the relative importance of relief aid to people’s overall survival strategies during emergencies.

In situations where survival strategies have been exhausted and people are forced into distress migration, the availability of food aid may well act as a considerable inducement. Food aid has been found to be a factor in preventing out-migration from rural areas, for example in chronically poor areas of Ethiopia (Pankhurst and Bevan, 2004). However, as Harvey and Lind (2005) argue, aid agencies tend to overstate the importance of relief assistance and under-estimate the contribution to survival made by sources other than aid. Moreover, relief and food aid are rarely provided with enough transparency that they can be relied upon by those in need. Uncertainty surrounding the amount and timing of aid deliveries, poor or opaque targeting, widespread sharing of relief entitlements and diversion

of relief by local elites are all factors that lessen the relative importance of relief aid to crisis-affected livelihoods. There is therefore a need for caution in assuming that food aid plays a dominant role in influencing migration decisions. Rather, it should be seen as one of many potential influences.

Food aid can influence decisions about whether or not to migrate when refugees or displaced people are offered assistance in areas of return. Food aid has been used as an inducement to return in Chechnya. Another common use of food aid to influence migration decisions is the closure of relief camps or distribution centres, as has been reported in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where Camp Aero in the Bunia area was closed in order to promote return (IRIN, 2005). It was also (notoriously) done in Tanzania to encourage refugees to return to Rwanda; as they re-entered Rwanda, thousands of Hutu were killed by Tutsis who suspected them of being associated with the 1994 genocide (Terry, 2002). In these cases, people moved in part in order to obtain access to food aid, but it is unlikely that this was the only reason for their untimely return. The desire to reclaim or rebuild lost assets, to make contact with those left behind in the crisis and a wish simply to get away from poor conditions in areas of displacement are also usually at play.

Just as food aid can be used as a partial inducement to people to return, it may also be used to help enable people to remain in their home areas throughout a crisis. In 1999, WFP in Ethiopia established decentralised distribution points in areas affected by severe food shortages. An explicit aim was to ensure that no one would have to travel more than 50km, since most people journeyed on foot and a trip longer than this would have necessitated abandoning their farms and staying closer to distribution centres. In Darfur in 2004–2005, people living around the Gareida IDP camp registered themselves as residents of the camp precisely so that they would not have to leave their homes; the food aid that they received helped them to retain the few assets they had left, improving their chances of rebuilding their livelihoods after the conflict.

2.3 Migration-sensitive assessments

2.3.1 Analytical frameworks

Current WFP emergency assessment practices focus on the broad issue of livelihoods. Within this framework, migration emerges as one strategy by which people seek to secure their livelihoods by maximising their income. Since migration is implicit in the analytical approach, the extent to which it is adequately covered depends largely on the questions that the assessor asks.

Livelihood analysis itself developed along two conceptual lines. The two main forms of livelihood analysis are (1) the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework; and (2) The Household Economy Approach. In practice, field workers often structure their inquiry around one analytical framework, but borrow ideas from the other. In this sense, the ideas from both analytical frameworks often inform a single inquiry.

Table 1: Analytical frameworks for livelihoods analysis

<p>Household Economy Approach Food access (food and income sources and expenditure patterns); access to essential non-food items. Food availability (markets: supply and price trends; market integration and trade flows). Food utilisation (diet quality; intra-household food distribution). Risk of food shortage = f (hazard, vulnerability [or baseline condition]).</p>	<p>Strengths Provides a rigorous protocol to develop detailed livelihood profiles at the household level; change is measured from a baseline to determine actual magnitude of food gaps on different wealth groups living in specified livelihood zones.</p>
<p>Sustainable Livelihoods Framework Livelihood assets (physical, natural, human, social, financial) and liabilities Processes, Institutions and Policies Livelihood strategies Livelihood goals and outcomes</p>	<p>Strengths Uses conflict analysis and considers the impact of macro-factors on local livelihoods</p>

2.3.2 Assessing migration

With a few important exceptions, assessment procedures and assistance policies do not usually explicitly consider the role of migration, either as an important contributor to food security in non-crisis times, or as a coping strategy when disaster strikes. The research for this review found no emergency food security assessment protocols that routinely consider the impact of shifting migration patterns on overall food security, except where mass displacement due to conflict or natural disaster has generated mass movement. This section considers the importance of migration-sensitive assessments, and shows how programming informed by such assessments can be improved.

WFP’s Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Unit (VAM), which compiles baseline profiles to explain the causes of food insecurity and vulnerability, looks at migration in two basic ways: as a livelihood strategy, and as a response to specific risks. Non-crisis-related migration is viewed as an activity pursued to ensure some stable flows of income and/or food (as payment might be in cash or kind). Analysis focuses on whether household members within a particular community migrate during or in the aftermath of a particular shock or stress. In Nepal, for instance, where it is estimated that approximately 20% of the country’s GDP (\$1 billion) is derived from labour migration overseas, VAM is currently examining whether migration is increasing as a result of the conflict, or whether economic factors are more important. This information may be helpful in developing an understanding of the nature of vulnerability to food insecurity, and for designing appropriate assistance strategies.

WFP’s Technical Meeting Report on Emergency Needs Assessment includes a useful chapter on a proposed minimum set of information to be included in an Emergency Needs Assessment (ENA) Report. However, neither the core information set on the livelihood situation of households, nor the separate section on refugees/IDPs, makes explicit mention of

migration as a key livelihood strategy, and neither section addresses how food aid affects migration decisions.

The UNHCR–WFP Joint Assessment Guidelines (2004) offer the user a comprehensive guide to collecting the information needed for a thorough and sophisticated analysis of the emergency needs of migrants. The guidelines address the three main themes that are central to the EFSA Handbook: food access, food availability and food utilisation. These joint guidelines cover shelter, water, health and sanitation, social attitudes and organisation, protection, food handling, storage and distribution and community services. They also explicitly address the situation and needs of the local host population, recommending that an initial assessment should address four issues: the food security situation; access to services; attitudes towards and relations with refugees; and the impact of migrants on the hosts' natural resources.

The Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET), a USAID-funded programme operates in 16 famine-prone countries in Africa and Latin America and in Afghanistan. FEWS NET is in the process of incorporating data on pre-crisis migration patterns into its baseline profiles. This activity is concentrated in countries where income from labour migration forms a major part of the household economy. One constraint to the effective monitoring of migration patterns is that early warning and response plans are often developed at the country level, and are not well coordinated with offices in neighbouring countries. This is despite the fact that many migration patterns, both before and during crises, involve the crossing of international borders. To address this, FEWS NET is preparing a 'migration map' to show labour migration and trade routes in Central America. This initiative came at the request of the individual FEWS NET country offices in light of the heavy influence of regional migration on local livelihoods. Such regional collaboration is also being piloted by FEWS NET in the Sahel and in the Horn of Africa. (The recent decentralisation of WFP decision-making to the regional level could potentially improve this type of regional coordination.)

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) uses household economy analysis and a general livelihoods approach in all of its economic security assessments. It routinely assesses the condition of both the displaced and their hosts when determining the type and amount of assistance provided. Assistance is regularly provided to hosts in order to minimise the burden imposed by the displaced and to preserve social networks on which hosting relationships are often based. In Darfur, for example, the ICRC surveyed host communities around Gareida, where they planned to establish a camp for displaced pastoralists. The agency asked future hosts to anticipate what the impact of large numbers of displaced people might be. Based on the results of this assessment, ICRC provided community-based health, water and sanitation services to these communities. This has enabled the hosts to share their resources with the migrants without having to make major sacrifices in their standard of living.

When assessments of displacement and disasters are conducted, the scope is often limited to the area that has suffered physical damage (Groupe URD, 2005). For example, those targeted for assistance may include the people who had been living in an area that was flooded, or those who lost their homes in an earthquake. The assessment does not consider those who had migrated into the area to find employment. Thus, in the aftermath of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, assistance was primarily targeted to people who had been living in the

coastal areas who had lost family members, property and their source of livelihoods. Yet in Somalia, for example, 20–30% of the total population in the affected area were migrants from further inland who had lost assets in a recent drought. These migrants' needs were not targeted because assistance was provided only to tsunami-affected coastal communities. No direct relief was offered to those who returned to their inland homes after having lost their income (FSAU, 2005). In Sri Lanka, government cash disbursements were targeted to anyone who had lost relatives, property or employment along the coast (WFP, 2005). In Thailand, illegal Burmese immigrants working in coastal resorts hit by the tsunami were particularly vulnerable because of their relative invisibility to local authorities and fear of being repatriated (Oberoi, 2005). In another example, in Malawi in 2001–2002 there was considerable distress migration to peri-urban slums which remained largely hidden to aid agencies because food security assessments focused on rural areas. A lesson learned from all of these examples is that assessments need to widen their scope to consider the possibility that the affected population may not live only within the area geographically affected by crisis.

2.4 Gender and age dimensions of migration decisions

As noted above, there are often important age and gender dimensions to migration patterns, and these must be considered. These are clearly context-specific, and need to be analysed on a case-by-case basis. In many situations, young men are the most likely to migrate, but some particular opportunities – such as for domestic work – mean that women also migrate. Older people are often least likely to migrate. Where children migrate, there may be particular protection issues that need to be considered. Good analysis of the gender and age dimensions of migration is important in understanding the vulnerabilities of those who remain behind, and those who migrate.

In distress migration and displacement during crises, an understanding of the gender and age dimensions of movement is also important, and again is context-specific. In many cases, those who migrate to camps include a disproportionate number of women. This may be because their access to resources is less secure than men's, or it may be because – with children to care for – they are not as able as men to migrate long distances to search for employment or to take their herds to dry-season grazing areas. In the Indian Ocean tsunami, many women were maintaining their homes while the male members of the household migrated to the coast to find employment in the fishing or tourism industries (Seager 2005; Oxfam, 2005).

2.5 Categorisations and groupings

There is a tendency for outsiders to categorise people affected by a crisis according to their location and movement; indeed, as mentioned above, these categories can affect people's rights and are enshrined in conventions and legal tools. But such groupings are not necessarily a good starting-point for assessing people's needs and targeting assistance. When disaster strikes and people migrate or are displaced from their homes, many opt to seek refuge or shelter among local communities rather than in camps. They may move in with relatives, clans people or friends, drawing on these social networks to provide support until they are able to return to their homes or establish themselves on their own in a new residence. Over time, the burden of providing for migrant guests may be a significant strain on hosts' resources. In this way, hosts themselves are affected by the emergency, albeit indirectly. Unfortunately, assistance is often targeted only at migrants or displaced people,

and not host or local communities. Donors, governments and operational agencies often find it difficult to provide assistance to host populations. They fear that including local populations in the estimates of numbers of people in need will be too expensive, and may lead to dependency on external assistance. In fact, despite the short-term costs, many of those interviewed who assist local communities found that, in the longer term, helping host communities to preserve their livelihood base helped to promote recovery for both hosts and migrants.

While migrant or displaced populations constitute a seemingly distinct category (pastoralist; labour migrant; refugee; internally displaced), they are typically quite dispersed. Often, their intermingling with people in other categories but very similar needs makes it difficult to recognise distinct groupings on the ground. The resulting homogeneity of needs can reduce the usefulness of categorisation for assessment. Moreover, these host communities may themselves be migrants, or may use migration as a livelihood strategy. Thus in theory we can draw up distinct categories – displaced populations, host populations and crisis-affected populations – who use migration as a livelihood strategy in normal years and/or in crisis years. However, in practice, people's situations are fluid and hard to label. A host today may be a displaced migrant tomorrow. The point is not to be limited by categories to a narrow vision of who is affected, but to keep the assessment broad enough to capture the full extent of the crisis.¹

WFP's experience in north-western Uganda provides a good example of the positive effects of providing food aid to both displaced populations and hosts:

The IDP population ... was largely made up of farmers who had been driven away from their farms and villages for security reasons. Their original coping mechanisms included resettling relatively close to their farms so that they could, when permitted, work on their land during the day. As the situation deteriorated, they fled further away and resorted to casual labour, shared cropping and grew small gardens, where possible. WFP's food aid was instrumental in supporting the coping mechanisms of the displaced and in establishing an overall climate of harmony between the displaced population and the host community. (Indeed, the displaced used food aid to pay for the use of the land of the host communities.)

In addition, WFP purchased part of its food locally, which, in this case, helped sustain the local economy. WFP also adopted flexible registration methods to enable IDPs to move closer to their land, acknowledged existing coping strategies and phased out as soon as possible by reducing the amounts and items distributed. This operation was key in enabling the displaced population to restore their own agriculture-based livelihoods (WFP, 2002).

¹ That said, distinctions are still important: wealth, ethnicity, gender and displacement status will all determine a group's access to resources. What resources they can access also determines how aid agencies can best support their efforts to survive, and to protect or rebuild their livelihoods.

Box 5: Inclusive or exclusive targeting?

When looking at targeting issues – who should be included or excluded in a humanitarian intervention – there is, according to SCF-UK (1999), a bottom line: that aid to migrants should not undermine the social structures of host communities. In practice, this means accepting that food rations may be redistributed within an affected community, as well as between migrant and host communities, and that this informal disbursement largely reflects social networks and a functioning local leadership. Care should be taken to avoid disrupting such networks. Excluding one category of person because they are not considered migrants or because it is assumed that they are not in need may ignore how resources are really allocated and shared, and strain these social structures.

2.6 Migration and programming

Without migration-sensitive assessments, assistance programming is often blind to the needs of the food insecure who depend on migration. Key programming issues include the location and frequency of distribution sites, who should be targeted and what types of assistance are needed. In other words, better analysis of migration relates to the key questions of where and when to provide help, what to provide and who to give it to.

2.6.1 Where?

One key question that a better understanding of migration issues can help to inform is where assistance should be provided. Assistance may be offered in areas far away from people's territory or area of origin. It may be offered in such small quantities and so frequently, or else with such little predictability, that people are not able to return to their home areas in between distribution periods to resume their productive activities. Thus, they settle close to the distribution sites to wait for the next distribution. In some cases, distribution centres are established relatively close to people's territory. However, affected populations are not able to take advantage of it because the centre lies within another group's territory, to which they do not have access or cannot ensure that local officials will give them an equitable share. This was the case with food distributions in the Blue Nile Province of Southern Sudan in 1998–99 (SCF-UK, 1999).

In Southern Sudan during the drought of 1998, food aid distributed at a central site remote from many pastoral settlements was found to contribute to the weakening of kinship and local leadership structures. Dinka sub-tribes located further from the central distribution site were at a disadvantage when it came to receiving rations. When the number of distribution centres was increased, and they were sited closer to the territories of these sub-tribes, assistance tended to reach those who needed it most, and had a much more positive effect on local food security (SCF-UK, 1999). In north-east Kenya in the late 1990s, a voucher system was established to assist pastoralists affected by drought to receive food aid without having to disrupt their seasonal migration with what remained of their herds. Recipients of vouchers could re-register at another of the dozens of distribution centres located throughout the affected area (Buchanan-Smith and Barton, 1999).

People often have to incur costs in transporting food aid from distribution sites to home areas, either renting transport or, if they are too weak, paying other people to carry it for them. This may also encourage the sale of food aid at distribution sites in order to minimise transport costs and buy other essential but less bulky goods. Project proposals and monitoring indicators sometimes include as an objective a maximum distance that people

should have to travel. It is less common to take into account people's regular movements in considering where to site distribution points. For example, people may have to travel to nearby market towns anyway, suggesting that distributions could be planned to coincide with market days.

2.6.2 What?

Understanding migration, mobility and displacement may also inform the type of assistance that is provided, and the appropriate balance between food aid and other responses. For example, the bulkiness of food aid may mean that, in some circumstances, cash or voucher options might be more appropriate for mobile populations. As Darcy and Hofmann (2003) argue, assessments should be less resource driven, and able to recommend a fuller range of options for responding to the risks facing livelihoods. In relation to migration strategies, for example, responses to crises in pastoralist areas might include fodder and water provision to maintain livestock herds. In populations where remittances are particularly important, people could be assisted in re-establishing contact with relatives through family tracing, or making communication and IT facilities available.

Food for work has particularly important implications for mobility and migration. The work requirement imposes significant restrictions on mobility. Traditionally, food for work has been provided in the agricultural off-season, on the assumption that this is when surplus labour is available (Harvey, 1998). But this may be precisely when particular forms of migration play a key role in livelihood strategies. Other relevant considerations include where the work is provided, and how far people have to travel to take part in public works schemes. The issues relevant to the location of free food distributions also apply to food for work. Ideally, the distance that people need to travel to reach the work site should be minimised, but the siting and location of work programmes could also take into account regular patterns of mobility and marketing.

It may also be relevant to consider the role of migration in the selection of public works for food for work programmes. Traditionally, projects have aimed to restore or increase agricultural productivity. However, a wider view of livelihoods, which includes an appreciation for the role of migration, might suggest other possibilities, such as projects that help to promote small towns as marketing nodes. A broader appreciation of complex livelihoods is also relevant in thinking through appropriate wage rates for public works programmes. If programmes are to be successful in self-targeting, wages need to be set slightly below market rates for casual labour. Assessments thus need to include information on local and regional labour markets.

Greater understanding of migration may also help to inform and influence targeting strategies. Better understanding of the importance of remittances and who receives them might suggest groups that are particularly vulnerable because they do not have access to remittances. In Darfur, the closure of the border with Libya and subsequent disruption to remittance flows created new types of vulnerabilities (Young et al., 2005). In Mongolia, remittances from urban relatives were important in preventing famine for some households, and urban contacts were crucial in offering the possibility of migration. Those households without such contacts were particularly vulnerable (Siurua and Swift, 2002).

This section has emphasised the importance of including migration in emergency food security assessments. It is meant to provide a basis for refining EFSA procedures. Specific

steps to be taken to assess the role of migration in an assessment are given in the next section.

3. Guidelines for emergency food security assessment incorporating migration

3.1 Introduction

This section outlines a protocol for migration-sensitive emergency food security assessments. Following on from the guidelines set out in the EFSA Handbook (First Edition) and the WFP/UNHCR guidelines, it suggests questions and methods, and offers examples of contexts in which such questions have been applicable. It goes on to consider some of the Response Options that a migration-sensitive assessment process might lead to, and proposes several contexts for field-testing the guidelines.

The Assessment Guidelines proposed here are not a departure from the approach advocated in the WFP Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook. What is required is that the role of migration in livelihoods is properly reflected in existing methodologies. By using the guidelines, the user will address crucial migration issues as part of good practice within food security assessments.

The guidelines address two fundamental themes:

1. Migration is often a central part of a population's usual livelihood strategy. Migration, and the income or food that is secured through it, may be disrupted by a crisis, resulting in food and income loss.
2. Displacement is a typical response to a crisis. The availability of food aid (or other types of assistance) is one factor among many influencing people's movement. This is true for both displaced populations, and the adjacent communities that may host them. Both groups are affected by the crisis, directly or indirectly, and livelihood strategies are changed by it, and the arrival of aid.

3.2 The analytical framework of the WFP EFSA Handbook

The EFSA Handbook describes a general analytical process based on the household economy approach. Migration is implicit, and is rarely treated in a separate inquiry. Because migration is increasingly a central feature of livelihoods in most rural economies, the methodology should be broadened to take account of this.

The basic analytical framework is described in Table 2, which is a partial reproduction of the EFSA's analytical framework. It shows the three core themes – food access, food availability and food utilisation – and the process of change (baseline condition, shock, household reaction or coping and aid response options). This analytic framework considers how livelihood strategies change in a crisis, what responses households adopt to make up food or income shortfalls, and the resulting final food or cash deficit.

Table 2: How to think about the EFSA analysis process

Food security analysis ----- analysis				Response options	
Theme	Impact	Reaction	Unmet needs & risks	Causes & opportunities	Response options
Food availability including markets	e.g. trade into area interrupted; 20% reduction in aggregate supply				
Food access and livelihoods	e.g. tools lost; 50% reduction in household food production; 20% reduction in cash income.				
Food utilisation and nutrition	e.g. cooking utensils lost; nutritional status of children declining				
WHY?	Context, Capacities and constraints				

Source: EFSA Handbook, Chapter 3, p. 34.

3.3 Proposed methodology

A separate methodology is not required to analyse the role of migration in livelihoods in pre-crisis and crisis periods. Instead, new questions are proposed to refine the existing guidelines such that migration becomes an explicit part of the analysis in any assessment. In particular, the guidelines proposed herein may be used for two types of situations:

- situations where no significant displacement has occurred, but where migration patterns are altered due to shock; and
- situations where the involuntary displacement of households or individuals has occurred following a shock (sudden or slow-onset).

Crisis-affected populations can cover a wide spectrum of households. They may include households torn apart by violence and war, as well as those whose livelihoods have been eroded over time due to a prolonged drought or a series of misfortunes. The contribution of migration to households' annual food needs in the pre-crisis and crisis economy depends on geography, wealth status, ethnicity and the policy environment. Migration issues need to be considered at each stage in the assessment process: (1) the collection of baseline data on main food and income sources (the baseline livelihood profile); (2) the impact of a current-year shock on sources of food and income from migration; 3) the reaction of migrant households to the crisis; and (4) the possible effects of food aid on migration

Ultimately, a crisis may displace households, but it may also wreak havoc by preventing people from engaging in the migration that had been an essential part of their pre-crisis livelihoods. Emergency Food Security Assessments should investigate the possibility that the crisis may have had either of these types of impacts.

3.4 Assessment checklist

This section highlights key questions that should be asked during assessments relating to migration and displacement. Three steps are highlighted:

- understanding pre-crisis migration patterns;
- assessing the impact of a crisis on migration patterns; and
- assessing how assistance should take migration into consideration, and how assistance may influence migration choices.

I. Understanding pre-crisis migration patterns

Objective: Assess the extent to which those who have been affected by disaster use migration as a regular livelihood strategy in non-crisis times, and what contribution this makes to household income and food security.

Need to know

For each livelihood and wealth group identified:

1. **What** types of migration (seasonal pastoral, labour, rural-urban, etc.) feature as essential aspects of livelihoods in non-crisis times?
2. **Who** typically migrates (whole households, men only, women only, teenaged boys or girls, etc.)?
3. **When** do they migrate (during the rainy season, during harvest time for major cash crops, during school holidays, etc)? **How long do they stay away** (this information can be obtained using a seasonal calendar (See EFSA Handbook Annex C-13))?
4. **Where** do people usually migrate to?
5. **How much (or what proportion)** of the household's income comes from migration? Rough estimates of the relative significance of each income type can be gained through proportional piling exercises (See EFSA Handbook Annex C-15).

It is helpful to identify a 'normal' year for respondents to refer to when answering the above questions. This may be framed in terms of the last good year, the previous year (if the crisis had not yet occurred) or, if people are comfortable with the concept, an 'average' year.

The answers to these questions form a fundamental baseline profile. Changes in one or more of these variables as a response to crisis may indicate distress and a possible need for assistance.

Good to know

If the assessment team has adequate time, it is useful to develop a more detailed baseline picture of pre-crisis migration practices. Such questions may include:

1. Pastoral communities. When conducting assessments with pastoral communities, a series of questions may help to provide a clearer picture of the role of migration.

- When, where, how far and for how long do pastoralists migrate? Does the entire community migrate together, or do only some members of the household migrate with the herd? Do the main camp and the ‘satellite’ camp both migrate, but to different areas? Are patterns of food and income access different seasonally for the main camp and satellite camp members? Are main camp and satellite camp members vulnerable to different hazards? Are there cross-border movements?

2. *Food/income availability.* The more information you can obtain about the income derived from migration practices, the better.

- What kind of work do migrants do? How much money do they earn? How much money do they send home? What are remittances and their migration-derived income typically used to buy? Are particular groups less vulnerable because they receive remittances? Is income from remittances or other transitory employment essential to food security during a particular season(s)?
- Identify types of food and income secured through livestock and/or labour migration (including remittance flows), both within and outside the country. Estimate the magnitude (e.g. kilo/year produced, money earned/year) and their proportional importance relative to a specified household’s annual food needs.

3. *Condition of labour markets.* Knowing about the degree of stability of labour markets provides important information about how markets will react to sudden increases in people seeking work.

- Map the destination areas for labour migration. Describe these markets in terms of absorption capacity and demand for labour. Examine trends in wages over previous years. Note whether there are alternative labour markets and, if so, where.

4. *Policy context and political economy.* Information about the ways in which migration may be restricted by government policies or political interests may help predict how migration strategies may change when crises occur.

- Determine whether (and how) policies affect migration. Are some forms of migration tolerated, while other forms are not? Are there cross-border movements? Do people risk losing their property in their areas of origin if they stay away for too long, or if the whole household migrates? Can migrant workers be employed legally, or are they dependent upon the informal sector? What political interests do the different stakeholders have in controlling or influencing migration?

5. *Gender and age.* While disaggregating migration patterns on the basis of gender and age are essential, if there is time to examine these issues in more detail valuable insights may be obtained into the way that livelihood strategies are employed by different people within the community.

- Do those ‘left behind’ undergo seasonal food shortages, even in normal years? Is the type of migration undertaken in a typical year different for men and women? Does this expose men and women to different risks? Are there particular risks and vulnerabilities faced by older people or children – either as migrants or those remaining? When some members of a household migrate, do the responsibilities of those who remain behind change (for example, do women take on responsibilities that

are traditionally the domain of men)? Are these changes permanent, or do people revert to their pre-crisis roles once the disaster has passed?

II. Assessing the impact of a crisis on migration patterns

Objectives: (1) Determine the extent to which normal migration practices are disrupted or modified because of a crisis and investigate whether access to essential livelihood resources is lacking; (2) Determine the extent of distress migration or crisis related displacement and identify the risks and vulnerabilities relating to this displacement that are being created.

Need to know

When migration patterns have changed in response to crisis

1. Have there been any changes in the essential characteristics of pre-crisis migration patterns (who, when, where, what types of migration do people engage in) as a response to the crisis?
 - Are more people migrating?
 - Are they going to the same place, or different places?
 - Are they migrating sooner than usual, or staying away from their homes for longer?
 - Are households migrating together, where previously only one or a few members had migrated?
2. Do people have assets to protect/preserve in their areas of origin, or are they bringing whatever assets they still have with them when they migrate? (People who are bringing assets with them may be anticipating a longer-term or permanent relocation.)
3. What factors, if any, are preventing people from being able to return to their areas of origin, or to resume their normal migration patterns?
4. Are people able to support themselves adequately through these altered migration patterns? If yes, for how long? If no, what are their needs? Are particular groups particularly affected? How?
5. What specific new or intensified risks or vulnerabilities arising from displacement or migration do women, men, children or the elderly have? Are women taking on risky ventures, such as leaving camps to return to villages to farm, or migrating weekly into towns in search of casual work, in order to access food or income?

Need to know

When the crisis-affected population is displaced

Some of the above 'need to know' questions may apply to those who are displaced from their homes and thus are forced to abandon their normal migration strategies. In addition, the following questions should be asked in contexts of displacement:

- Why have the displaced chosen to migrate to this location (protection/security, availability of resources, to be close to kin living in the area, etc.)?
- Are the displaced completely dependent upon assistance, or are they able to practice some of their original livelihood strategies?
- What is the food security situation of the host population? Have they also been affected by the crisis, or has hosting the displaced placed an unmanageable burden on their livelihoods?

Good to know

If the assessment team has adequate time, or a follow-up detailed assessment can be done, it is useful to gather additional information about the following:

1. Pastoral migration

- Are pastoral migration routes disrupted as a result of the crisis? Are people moving into new areas to find pasture and water for their herds? If normal dry season pastures are cut off are there alternatives? How far away are alternative pastures, and what is the impact on household access to the satellite herd? Conversely, if herders cannot travel to alternative pastures, is concentration around main permanent water points over-straining local resources? Are conflicts over natural resources emerging? Are agriculturalists planting crops on pastoral grazing areas? If yes, does this lead to conflict with other communities with a territorial claim to this land?
- If displacement has occurred, has the influx limited pastoralist access to crucial grazing areas, water points and/or dry season forest reserves? Is there greater competition and conflict over established resources? Are alternative routes and sites being sought? What are the short- and long-term implications of greater concentrations of people at water points, greater competition and conflict over resources, and the use of riskier alternative sites on host households' access to food and income?

2. Protection/security

- Have people's movements been restricted by violence, or is fear of violence motivating people to move? Are the locations that people are moving to areas where they feel relatively safe and protected, or are there other reasons for choosing these sites (e.g. greater availability of resources, social ties to local communities)?

3. Food access

- Estimate the magnitude of food and income lost from a disruption of migration routes and destination markets. For example, there might be disruptions to access to pastures or land usually reached through seasonal migration, to markets for casual labour or to seasonal employment.

4. Income access

- Assess changes in the selling prices of cash crops and livestock products that may be caused by changing migration patterns. Record any changes in wage rates as a result of changing labour supply. How has the crisis impacted on remittances flows? Are particular groups especially affected by restricted migration or remittance flows?

5. Food/income availability

- Assess the impact of the shock on markets accessed through migration in terms of supply and price of essential food and non-food items. In the event of a border closure

or other restrictions to movement, have alternative labour and livestock markets opened up?

6. *Gender and age*

- What is the gender and age breakdown of crisis-related displacement?

7. *Policy context and political economy*

- Has the crisis caused further restrictions on migration and mobility? If people are adopting new migration patterns, are they subject to regulation? If yes, does this reduce the number of people migrating, or compel people to search for alternative coping strategies?

8. *Emergency preparedness*

- If conditions deteriorate, is further displacement likely? It is likely that the host population itself might carry out distress migration. Where are they likely to go?

9. *Environmental impacts*

- What effect does displacement have on the environmental resources in an area? Pastoralist environments are highly fragile and may not be suited to large concentrations of people. The consequences for natural resources of a swelling settled population in a dryland region, or of a change in access to these resources, must be anticipated to limit the environmental stress and to safeguard access to essential resources.

III. Assessing how assistance should consider migration

Objectives: (1) Assess the real or potential impact of aid assistance, particularly food aid, on migration patterns; (2) Identify issues specifically relating to migration that are relevant in recommending programming responses.

Need to know

1. How significant are levels of likely assistance going to be, relative to people's overall response to crisis?
2. Is the availability of aid assistance likely to influence patterns of movement and displacement, not only of those currently being displaced, but also of host communities?
3. If local residents are moving into the area where the displaced are receiving assistance, what are their reasons for doing so (to obtain access to aid resources, to be close to kin, to gain greater protection/security, etc.). Is their movement into the area the result of their own vulnerability, either as a result of hosting the displaced or in response to the crisis? Has this movement disrupted their own normal migration patterns?
4. Where should aid be delivered and distributed in order to enable people to maintain constructive livelihood and coping strategies, including those associated with mobility and migration? Where further migration would have a negative impact on livelihoods and security, how can assistance help people to stay in place?
5. Are there migration-related issues that should be taken into account in deciding the frequency of distributions? For instance, should food be distributed in larger amounts less frequently, so that pastoralists have time to move with their herds between distributions?
6. Have families been separated during the crisis? If yes, what activities can help to reunite families in order to rehabilitate communication channels and stimulate remittances? (Family tracing may also help to determine where all members of separated families migrated, revealing pockets of crisis-affected migrants in places initially beyond the area of targeted assistance.)

Good to know

1. Mobility

- Are there particular measures that might help to support mobility (support for pack animals, bicycles, or other forms of transport)? Are there any interventions or advocacy that could enable resumption of livestock migration and trade routes?

2. Access to food aid

- Are social networks between the displaced or crisis-affected population allowing the local population to access food aid (albeit informally)? Does this present a problem in terms of diluting the amount of food that the displaced/crisis-affected are able to access? If hosts share food aid with the displaced, does this mean that they are also in need of emergency assistance?

3. Policy

- What are the rules governing aid distributions? Do these need to be modified to enable continued mobility? For example, are people able to access relief assistance at more than one site, or can they send a proxy to collect aid?
- What protection measures must be put in place to safeguard aid recipients' mobility, whether to reach their farms, grazing areas or labour markets? What can aid agencies do to encourage the actors responsible to permit such freedom of movement?

3.5 Assessment tools, methods and process

Addressing the questions outlined in the checklists above do not require any substantial innovation in the tools and methods already outlined in the first edition of the Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook. Data collection includes the normal mix of survey, semi-structured interviewing and in-depth participatory discussions. As argued above, the challenge is to explicitly address issues around migration and displacement within existing methodologies.

There are a few issues of process and methodology in which better analysis of migration raises particular challenges. Analysis of income sources can often be difficult if people are reluctant to fully reveal their sources of income, especially where the assessment is seen to be linked to potential resources. In such cases, people may want to under-report their income in their responses to assessors. Accurate information about income from remittances can often be particularly difficult to get because it is less obvious and less visible than other sources. There is likely to be a particular need, therefore, for carefully triangulating information about remittances, and thinking creatively about where information can be sought. Secondary information sources on pre-crisis remittance flows may be particularly important. It may also be possible to seek to triangulate information on remittances from crisis-affected populations with information from key informants, such as money transfer representatives.

It is also important to think about where the assessment is carried out. Fully capturing information relating to migration and its role in livelihoods may require a focus not only on the disaster-affected area, but also on some of the main destinations for both pre-crisis migration and crisis-related displacement. As an example, Young et al.'s (2005) analysis of livelihoods in Darfur greatly benefited from research in Libya as well as in Darfur. Rapid assessments in peri-urban areas may be particularly valuable in gathering information about the extent of distress migration.

Finally, there is clearly a need to include potential beneficiaries and other stakeholders from whom information is solicited in the process of formulating recommendations. In making recommendations on issues such as where, how often and what type of assistance should be provided, this implies a need to consult as well as to inform disaster-affected populations. Mechanisms must be created to enable this sort of consultation to take place so that the voices of disaster-affected people are better represented in recommendations about response options.

3.6 Protocol for field testing

The questions above are intended to be used in conjunction with EFSA procedures to generate more migration-sensitive assessments. The review recommends that these guidelines be tested by incorporating them into future EFSA assessments in countries experiencing different types of crisis. This initial testing would best be accomplished by seconding an additional team member (a consultant) to the assessment team. This individual would test the guidelines for their suitability, and evaluate their impact on the EFSA. This person would need to have had significant past experience with EFSA assessments, and should be familiar with working with mobile and displaced populations. It is proposed to field test the migration assessment guidelines in three countries, selected from the following five possibilities: Niger (drought, market failure); Ethiopia (chronic food insecurity with mobile populations); Sri Lanka/India (tsunami); Guyana (hurricane); Afghanistan (conflict/floods).

Field testing of the migration-oriented guidelines should take place together with emergency needs assessments. Questions should be integrated into livelihoods analyses as presented in the EFSA Handbook. The migration specialist/consultant serving on the team should write up the results of the assessment, noting whether the guidelines as written were useful, recording any additional questions that arose in the process of the fieldwork and developing recommendations for migration-sensitive assistance. Recommendations should also be incorporated into the EFSA team's overall recommendations.

4. Conclusion

This review has considered migration as a livelihood strategy in non-crisis or pre-crisis times, as well as during crises. It has sought to challenge common misperceptions about migration as necessarily a negative livelihood practice, and the alleged tendency of people living close to migrants to present themselves as migrants too in the hope of obtaining aid. The political economy of migration, which tends to restrict the rights of migrants even to the point of violating international refugee and human rights law, has been highlighted.

Despite the importance of migration to people's livelihoods, this review has argued that migration issues are not adequately covered by established emergency food security assessment guidelines. More migration-sensitive assessments, focusing on the normal and crisis-time uses of migration, can provide important information about the ways that a crisis can affect a population; the forms of resilience that the population may rely on to withstand a shock and the likely ways in which people may use migration in response to crisis.

Migration-sensitive assessments can help to inform the programming of emergency assistance so that it builds on people's own coping strategies, safeguarding positive migration practices and helping people to avoid resorting to distress migration or displacement. Such assessments can point not only to the extent of needs, but also to ways of providing assistance that maximise the familiar livelihood strategies of people affected by crisis.

Bibliography

- Age, L. (2005) 'IDPs confined to barracks in Aceh', *Forced Migration Review*, Tsunami Edition.
- ALNAP Global Study (2003) *Participation by crisis affected populations in humanitarian action*.
- Black, R. (2004) *Migration and Pro-Poor Policy in Africa*, Sussex Centre for Migration Research, Working Paper C6.
- Buchanan-Smith, M. and D. Barton (1999) *Evaluation of the Wajir Emergency Relief Programme: 1996-1998*.
- Buchanan-Smith, M. and I. Christoplos (2004) *Natural Disasters Amid Complex Political Emergencies*, Report on a Seminar hosted by the British Red Cross.
- Burke A. and Afnan (2005) *Aceh: Reconstruction in a Conflict Environment, Views from Civil Society, Donors and NGOs*, <http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/sumatra/reliefrecovery/cross/docs/AcehReconstructionConflictFinal-220805.pdf>.
- Christoplos, I. (2004) *Out of Step? Agricultural Policy and Afghan Livelihoods*, Afghan Research and Evaluation Unit, Issue Paper Series.
- Collinson, S. (2003) *Power, Livelihoods and Conflict: Case Studies in Political Economy Analysis for Humanitarian Action*, Humanitarian Policy Group Report 13, Overseas Development Institute.
- Corbett, J. (1988) 'Famine and household coping strategies', *World Development*, vol. 16, no. 9.
- Crisp, J. (2004) *The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis*, UNHCR, New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper 102.
- Crisp, J. and K. Jacobsen (1998) 'Refugee Camps Reconsidered', *Forced Migration Review*, December 1998.
- Darcy, J. and C.-A. Hoffman (2003) *According to need? Needs assessment and decision making in the humanitarian sector*, HPG Report 15, Overseas Development Institute.
- De Haan, A. (2003) 'Livelihoods and poverty: the role of migration – a critical review of the migration literature', *Journal of Development Studies*, 36.
- De Haan, A., K. Brock and Coulibaly (2002) 'Migration, Livelihoods and Institutions: Contrasting Patterns of Migration in Mali', *Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 38, no. 5.
- De Haan, A. and B. Rogaly (2002) 'Introduction: Migrant Workers and Their Role in Rural Change', *Journal Of Development Studies*, vol. 38, no. 5.
- De Waal, A. (2004) *Famine that Kills. Darfur 1984–1985*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Waal, A. (1997) 'A reassessment of entitlement theory in the light of recent famines in Africa', *Development and Change*, vol. 21, no. 3.
- De Waal, A. (1988) 'Famine Early Warning Systems and the use of Socio-Economic Data', *Disasters*, vol.12, no. 1: 86–91.
- Deshingkar, P. (2004) *Understanding the Implications of Migration for Pro-poor Agricultural Growth*, ODI Issues Paper.
- Deshingkar, P. (2004) *Livelihood diversification in developing countries*, DAC Network on Poverty Reduction.
- Deshingkar, P. and D. Start (2003) *Seasonal Migration for Livelihoods in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion*, ODI Working Paper 22.

- Ellis, F. (2000) *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, F. and T. Woldehanna (forthcoming 2005) 'Ethiopia Participatory Poverty Assessment', Ministry of Economic Development, Government of Ethiopia.
- Farrington, J. (1998) 'Organisational roles in farmer participatory research and extension: lessons from the last decade', *ODI Natural Resource Perspectives*, 27.
- FEWS NET (2005) *Niger Country Profile*, Famine Early Warning System Network, Washington DC.
- Food Security Assessment Unit (FSAU)-Somalia (2005) *InterAgency Assessment Mission: Hafun to Ga'arad, Northeast Somali Coastline*. Nairobi: FSAU.
- Government of Ethiopia, USAID/FEWS NET, Food Economy Group (2005) *Livelihood Profiles from SNNPR, Ethiopia*.
- Groupe URD (2005) *Real-time review of selected food aid and non-food programmes implemented in Afghanistan and implications for emergency food security assessments*, report submitted to WFP.
- Hammond, L., S. Anderson, J. Holt and W. Chinogwenya (2005) *Livelihoods and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention*. Washington DC: United States Agency for International Development.
- Hammond, L. and B. Dessalegn (2004) 'Evaluation of the 2003 Pilot Resettlement "Safara" Programme', in A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet, *People, Space and the State: Migration, Resettlement and Displacement in Ethiopia*, Ethiopian Society of Sociologists, Social Workers and Anthropologists, Addis Ababa.
- HAPI (2005) Membership Page, <http://www.hapinternational.org/en/page.php?IDpage=9&IDcat=2>.
- Harmer, A. and J. Macrae (2004) *Beyond the Continuum: The Changing Role of Aid Policy in Protracted Crises*, HPG Report 18.
- Harrell-Bond, B. (1986) *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, P. (1998) *Guidelines on the Use of Food for Work and Cash for Work in Food Security Programmes and Emergency Aid: A Report for GTZ*.
- Harvey, P. and J. Lind (2005) *Dependency and Humanitarian Relief: A Critical Analysis*. HPG Report 19.
- Hoffman, C.-A. (2004) *Measuring the Impact of Humanitarian Aid: A Review of Current Practice*, HPG Research Briefing 15.
- IASC (2000) *Inter-Agency Standing Committee Policy on Forced Relocation ('Regroupement') in Burundi*.
- IRIN (2005) 'DRC: NGO Suspends Operations in Camp for 7,000 IDPs', July.
- Lind, J. and T. Jalleta (2005) *Poverty, power and relief assistance: meanings and perceptions of 'dependency' in Ethiopia*, HPG Background Paper.
- Macrae, J. and A. Zwi (1994) *War and Hunger: Rethinking International Responses to Complex Emergencies*. London: Zed Books.
- Malkki, L. (1995) 'Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 24: 495-523.
- McDowell, C. and A. De Haan (1997) 'Migration and Sustainable Livelihoods: A Critical Review of the Literature', *IDS Working Paper*, 65.
- Oberoi, P. (2005) 'Humanitarian Response Towards Burmese Migrant Workers', *Forced Migration Review*, Tsunami Special Edition.

OCHA (1998) *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*. Geneva: UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

OFDA DART Team (2005) Niger Sitrep 9: Analyzing Agriculturalist Household Economies, September.

Oxfam (2005) *The tsunami's impact on women*, Oxfam Briefing Note, March.

Pankhurst, A. and P. Bevan (2004) *Coping with Hunger and Poverty in Ethiopia: Stories from Twenty Rural Areas*, WeD Briefing Paper 1, Wellbeing in Developing Countries, ESRC Research Group.

Phillips, M. (2003) 'The role and impact of humanitarian assets in refugee-hosting countries', UNHCR, *New Issues In Refugee Research*, Working Paper 84.

Ratha, D. (2003) 'Workers' remittances: an important and stable source of development finance', *Global Development Finance I*.

SCF-UK (1999) *Postscript to the Southern Sudan Vulnerability Study on the 1998 Crisis*.

SCHR (1994) *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief*, RRN Network Paper 7, Overseas Development Institute.

SDC (2004) *Cash for Shelter Programme as Part of Humanitarian Aid*, Swiss Agency for Cooperation and Development.

Seager, J. (2005) 'Natural disasters expose gender divides', *Chicago Tribune*, September.

Siurua, H. and J. Swift (2002) 'Drought and Zud but No Famine (Yet) in the Mongolian Herding Economy', *IDS Bulletin*, vol. 33, no. 4.

Sphere Project (2004) *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response*.

Stites, E. and S. Lautze (2005) *Through a livelihood lens: a case study on the impact of humanitarian assistance in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, HPG Background Paper.

Swift, J., D. Barton and J. Morton (2002) *Drought management for pastoral livelihoods – policy guidelines for Kenya*.

Tacoli, C. (2002) *Changing rural–urban interactions in sub-Saharan Africa and their impacts on livelihoods: a summary*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Terry, F. (2002) *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

UNHCR and WFP (2004) *UNHCR/WFP Joint Assessment Guidelines*.

Verdirame, G. and B. Harrell-Bond (2005) *Rights in Exile: Janus-Faced Humanitarianism*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books

Waddington, H. and V. Sabates-Wheeler (2003) *How Does Poverty Affect Migration Choice? A Review of Literature*, Working Paper T3, Development Research Centre on Migration Globalisation and Poverty.

Waddington, H. (2003), Working Paper T1, Development Research Centre on Migration Globalisation and Poverty.

WFP (2005) *Sri Lanka Tsunami Recovery Programming and Follow-Up Needs Assessment Mission Report*.

WFP (2002) *Food Aid in Conflict Workshop Report*.

Young, H. et al. (2005) *Darfur – Livelihoods Under Siege*, Feinstein International Famine Center, Tufts University.

List of interviewees

Gilles Bergeron	FANTA
Isobel Birch	Consultant, formerly with OXFAM
Gideon Cohen	WFP-Ethiopia, formerly IOM
Chuck Chopak	FEWS NET
Richard Choularton	FEWS NET
Sheila Gruden	WFP
Thomas Gurtner	International Committee of the Red Cross
Nick Haan	Somalia Food Security Assessment Unit
Anette Haller	WFP
Simon Harrigan	Consultant, formerly SCF-UK
Charlotte Heath	DfID
Pascal Joannes	EU Ethiopia Delegation
Veronique Lorenzo	EU Ethiopia Delegation
Ellen Mathys	Food Economy Group/FEWS NET
Alain Morey	International Committee of the Red Cross
Moira Reddick	British Red Cross
Tim Shortley	USAID
Roy Stacy	FEWS NET
Nicole Steyer	WFP
Tim Waites	DfID
Samir Wanmali	WFP Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Unit
Barbara Wildi	International Committee of the Red Cross
Helen Young	Tufts University