Key points

To monitor the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on household food security, WFP Uganda expanded the coverage of its food security monitoring system to include urban areas in addition to refugee settlements, refugee hosting districts and Karamoja. Starting from May 2020, data was collected continuously from 13 refugee settlements and hosting districts, all the 9 districts of Karamoja districts, Kampala based refugees and 13 urban areas.

The proportion of households with insufficient food consumption was 44 percent among settlement based refugees, 28 percent among Kampala based refugees, and 41 percent among nationals in host communities. The proportion of settlement refugee households with insufficient food consumption decreased from 54 percent in June 2020 to 44 percent in July 2020.

In urban area, 17 percent of urban nationals had insufficient food consumption in the first half of July 2020, a similar level with June 2020. In Karamoja, 41 percent of national households had insufficient food consumption in July 2020, an improvement from July 2019 (50 percent) and June 2020 (46 percent).

Situation update

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the government of Uganda instituted restrictions to economic activity and physical movement from the 18th of March 2020. To monitor the impact on some of the most impacted populations, WFP Uganda expanded its remote monitoring system (mVAM) to provide near-real time updates on the food security situation in refugee settlements, refugee hosting communities, urban centres across the country and in the Karamoja region.

In July 2020, 44 percent of settlement based refugees had insufficient food consumption, slightly better than the pre-COVID period in March 2020 (56 percent) and June 2020 (54 percent). The proportion of households in Karamoja with insufficient food consumption increased significantly in July and was higher than that of refugee households living in settlements as indicated in Figure 1.

The proportion of households with insufficient consumption was lowest amongst urban nationals compared to other population groups in June and July 2020.

Kampala based refugees had better food consumption in contrast to their counterparts - the settlement based refugees (proportion of households with insufficient food consumption: 28 percent for Kampala based refugees vs 44 percent for settlement based refugees).
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Food consumption

Urban Areas and Kampala Based Refugees

Overall, 17 percent of urban nationals had insufficient food consumption in the first half of July 2020.

The proportion of households with insufficient food consumption (28 percent) was higher amongst Kampala based refugees compared to urban nationals - figure 2.

Jinja had the highest proportion of urban nationals with inadequate food consumption (23 percent) while Mbarara (12 percent) had the lowest - figure 3.

Kampala based refugees with inadequate food consumption increased from 24 percent in June 2020 to 28 percent in the first half of July 2020. The proportion of urban nationals with insufficient food consumption remained the same from June to the first half of July 2020 - figure 3.

Settlement Based Refugees and Host Communities

In July 2020, 44 percent of settlement based refugees had insufficient food consumption. This was higher than their counterparts - Kampala based (28 percent).

Kyaka II settlement had the highest proportion of refugee households with inadequate food consumption (98 percent). Druchina had the lowest (1 percent). The proportion of refugee households with insufficient food consumption decreased from 60 percent in July 2019 and 54 percent in June 2020 to 44 percent in July 2020—figure 4.

Overall for nationals, 41 percent of households had insufficient food consumption. This was slightly lower than for settlement based refugees but higher then for Kampala based refugees.

Palabek (Lamwo district) had the most households with insufficient consumption (87 percent), while Nakivale (Isingiro) had the least (2 percent). The proportion of national households with insufficient food consumption decreased from 58 percent in July 2019 to 41 percent in July 2020, but was higher than in June 2020 (26 percent ) – figure 5.

Fig. 2: Food consumption of nationals in urban areas and Kampala based refugees

Fig. 3: Proportion of households with insufficient (poor and borderline) food consumption by district

Fig. 4: Food consumption of host communities and settlement based refugees

Fig. 5: Proportion of households with insufficient (poor and borderline) food consumption by settlement and Host District.

Source: WFP Uganda, mVAM, July 2020
Food consumption

Karamoja

In Karamoja, 41 percent of households had insufficient food consumption in July 2020 - figure 6.

Kaabong, Karamoja Moroto had the most households with insufficient food consumption, while Nabilatuk and Kotido had the least households - figure 7.

Nakapiripirit and Nabilatuk, made a significant improvement by reducing over one-third compared to June 2020. The proportion of households with insufficient food consumption decreased from 50 percent in July 2019 and 46 percent in June 2020, to 41 percent in July 2020 - figure 6.

Improvement in food consumption could be as a result of the start of the first season harvests and government lifting of the COVID-19 lockdown which has allowed gradual resumption of economic activity and enhanced access to markets.

Food based coping strategies

Urban Areas and Kampala Based Refugees

Overall, 24 percent of nationals in urban areas applied medium or high food based coping strategies in the first half of July 2020. The proportion of households applying medium or high food based coping strategies was much higher for Kampala based refugees (57 percent) - figure 8.

Use of medium and high food based consumption was most pronounced (36 percent) in Arua and least pronounced in Mbarara (16 percent) - figure 9.

The proportion of urban nationals applying medium or high food based coping strategies decreased from 36 percent in June 2020 to 24 percent in July 2020. There was no significant change for Kampala based refugees between June and July 2020.
### Food based coping strategies

#### Settlement Based Refugees and Host Communities

Overall, 33 percent of settlement based refugee households applied medium or high food based coping strategies in Jul 2020. Use of medium or high food based coping strategies was lower in settlement based refugees compared to Kampala based refugees (57 percent) – figure 10.

Amongst refugee settlements, use of medium or high food based coping strategies was highest in Rwamwanja (69 percent) and lowest in Palorinya (2 percent). The proportion of settlement based refugee households applying medium or high food based coping strategies increased from 19 percent in July 2019 to 33 percent in July 2020, but was lower than in June 2020 (48 percent).

Among host communities, 27 percent of households applied medium or high food based coping strategies. This was better when compared to refugees in settlements. Bidi–bidi had the highest use of medium or high food based coping strategies among other surveyed refugee hosting districts (40 percent).

Application of medium or high food based coping strategies increased from four percent in July 2019 to 27 percent in July 2020, which was similar to June 2020.

#### Karamoja

In Karamoja, 50 percent of national households applied medium or high food based coping strategies in July 2020.

Karenza, Kaabong and Nabilatuk had the highest proportion of households applying medium or high coping strategies, while Nakapiripirit and Abim had the lowest proportion of households.

The proportion of households applying medium or high food based coping strategies in July 2020 (50 percent) was lower than in June 2020 (55 percent) and July 2019 (56 percent).

This trend is attributed to the gradual easing of COVID-19 lock down measures across the country the resumption of economic activity.
Livelihood Coping Strategies — Urban areas

Fig. 14: Proportion of households employing livelihood based coping strategies

Fig. 15: Proportion of households employing crisis or emergency livelihood coping strategies by district

Fig. 16: Top 5 livelihood coping strategies used

Fig. 17: Proportions of households with specific demography affected by the coronavirus and the government restrictions

Fig. 18: Proportions of households whose livelihoods have been affected by COVID 19

Fig. 19: Food assistance to households by any organization

Source: WFP Uganda, mVAM, July 2020
Livelihood Coping Strategies — Refugee hosting areas

Fig. 20: Proportion of households employing livelihood based coping strategies

Fig. 21: Proportion of households employing crisis or emergency livelihood coping strategies by settlement

Fig. 22: Top 5 livelihood coping strategies used

Fig. 23: Proportions of households with specific demography affected by the coronavirus and the government restrictions

Fig. 24: Proportions of households whose livelihoods have been affected by COVID 19

Fig. 25: Household planted in this season

Source: WFP Uganda, mVAM, July 2020
## Market access

### Fig. 32: Market access and reasons for not being able to access markets - Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Market Was Accessible</th>
<th>Market Closed</th>
<th>Lockdown</th>
<th>Disease Concern</th>
<th>Insecurity</th>
<th>Transport Expensive</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubende</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakasonge</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinja</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lira</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masaka</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasere</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbarara</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbulu</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabarole</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fig. 33: Market access and reasons for not being able to access markets - Refugee hosting areas

| Area          | Kampala | Rhino-Camp | Nakavale | Imvepi | Rwamwanja | Kibuli | Bidibidi | Kinyongi | Nkoko | Lopule | Kyaliro | Palabek | Nakajjara | Orikiriza | Kyangwali | West Nile | South West | Total |
|---------------|---------|------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|-------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Market Was Accessible | 66%     | 68%        | 57%      | 57%    | 57%       | 38%    | 48%      | 38%      | 48%   | 38%    | 48%     | 48%     | 48%       | 48%      | 48%      | 48%       | 48%       | 48%    |
| Market Closed   | 5%      | 7%         | 3%       | 15%    | 13%       | 33%    | 10%      | 15%      | 33%   | 10%    | 15%     | 33%     | 10%       | 15%      | 33%      | 10%       | 15%       | 33%    |
| Lockdown        | 1%      | 1%         | 1%       | 1%     | 1%        | 1%     | 1%       | 1%       | 1%    | 1%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%        | 1%       | 1%       | 1%        | 1%        | 1%     |
| Disease Concern | 1%      | 1%         | 1%       | 1%     | 1%        | 1%     | 1%       | 1%       | 1%    | 1%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%        | 1%       | 1%       | 1%        | 1%        | 1%     |
| Insecurity      | 1%      | 1%         | 1%       | 1%     | 1%        | 1%     | 1%       | 1%       | 1%    | 1%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%        | 1%       | 1%       | 1%        | 1%        | 1%     |
| Transport Expensive | 1%    | 1%          | 1%       | 1%    | 1%        | 1%     | 1%       | 1%       | 1%   | 1%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%        | 1%       | 1%       | 1%        | 1%        | 1%     |
| Other           | 1%      | 1%         | 1%       | 1%     | 1%        | 1%     | 1%       | 1%       | 1%    | 1%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%        | 1%       | 1%       | 1%        | 1%        | 1%     |

### Fig. 34: Market access and reasons for not being able to access markets - Karamoja

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Nakapiripirit</th>
<th>Nabitatuk</th>
<th>Moroto</th>
<th>Karenga</th>
<th>Napak</th>
<th>Amudat</th>
<th>Abim</th>
<th>Kaborong</th>
<th>Kotido</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Was Accessible</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Closed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockdown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease Concern</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Expensive</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WFP Uganda, mVAM, July 2020

## Methodology

The coronavirus pandemic and the strategies employed by governments to control its spread have had far-reaching effects on food security and livelihoods globally. In Uganda, restrictions put in place by the Government of Uganda from the 18th of March 2020 to protect the population have disrupted livelihoods and food access for large segments of Ugandans. The increased risk of shocks to food security and essential needs coincided with increased difficulty of monitoring the situation through traditional in-person surveying and data collection. Because of the importance to maintain situational awareness, WFP Uganda scaled up its remote monitoring system to obtain near real time food security information of refugees and nationals in 13 refugee hosting areas, urban population in 13 urban centres as well as nationals in 9 districts of Karamoja region. Live telephone interviews started from 10th May and continues daily. During the reporting period of this bulletin, 2,417 national households in 13 urban centres, 1,274 refugee households and 1,806 national households from 13 refugee hosting areas, 143 refugee households in Kampala as well as 1,300 national households from Karamoja region were randomly selected. Although the sample was drawn using a structured random selection technique, it may have been biased due to inequalities in mobile phone ownership along lines of wealth and gender. The sample size is statistically representative at each settlement/district at minimum with a margin of error of 10 percent at a 95 percent confidence level.

For further information please contact the Analysis, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (AMEL) unit WFP Uganda

Anders Petersson, Head of AMEL
Takahiro Utsumi, Food security analyst
Stanslus Okurut, VAM officer
Amina Mubuka, VAM Associate
Nathan Lownyang, VAM Associate

mVAM Resources:
Website: [http://vam.wfp.org/sites/mvam_monitoring/](http://vam.wfp.org/sites/mvam_monitoring/)
Blog: [mvam.org](http://mvam.org)
Toolkit: [http://resources.vam.wfp.org/mVAM](http://resources.vam.wfp.org/mVAM)
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