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1. Introduction: The Need for Cash and Credit During Protracted Displacement

The problem of how to support refugees\(^1\) and internally displaced people in protracted situations continues to challenge aid agencies. As conflicts drag on, sometimes for a decade or more, displaced people find themselves in ‘protracted situations’ — unable to return to their home countries, without the resources they need to survive, and with no solutions to their predicament in sight. One of the defining characteristics of protracted situations is the rapid decline in the supply of humanitarian assistance, including food aid. In refugee camps, after an ‘emergency’ ends and the TV cameras leave, humanitarian assistance gradually decreases. The longer camps persist, the fewer resources there are to be found. If refugees settle amongst the local population, they receive very little international assistance and must depend on the kindness of their hosts. Increasingly, governments impose restrictions on the displaced, requiring them to live in camps and limiting travel or work outside the camps. Those who seek to pursue livelihoods in urban areas face many problems, and are seldom assisted by humanitarian agencies.

As assistance declines, income becomes an urgently pressing need. Money is needed to buy firewood, for transportation, for rent, for bribes, and for school and hospital fees. Since there is little employment available—or land for farming and livestock—most people have to generate income through small enterprises such as petty trade and services (barbers, food makers, artisans, translators). Credit is needed to start up or grow such enterprises, but displaced people have very few sources of cash or credit. In refugee camps, there are no banks, and urban refugees cannot access them. Many must resort to the use of exploitative moneylenders, or to illegitimate livelihood strategies, others are susceptible to exploitation, many become dangerously indebted. The difficulties of finding access to legitimate, non-exploitative livelihoods and sources of income constitute one of the most serious problems facing displaced people today.

Aid agencies now increasingly recognize the importance of supporting the efforts of displaced people to pursue their own livelihoods. Humanitarian interventions such as microcredit and various income generating or cash-for-work programs have been attempted. They are generally intended to enable refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs) become economically self-reliant, or at least to reduce their dependence on relief assistance. However, these programs are often the first to be cut, and in general they are not well resourced, understood or evaluated. Moreover, when funded, they are often of poor quality, since it is difficult to directly translate relief experience into effective livelihood programs. More knowledge and information about the role of these kinds of programs in supporting displaced people in protracted situations is needed.

---

\(^{1}\) The term ‘refugee’ is used in its broadest sense here to refer to registered refugees, asylum seekers, and those with various types of temporary permission to stay. It does not include migrants who have come to find work, although it is often difficult to separate categories of people from the same conflict-affected country.
2. The Alchemy Project

The Alchemy Project began in 2001 as a pilot program to explore whether income generating interventions do support the livelihoods of forcibly displaced people. Our long-term goals were to work with humanitarian agencies and donors to develop programs and policies that support the livelihoods of displaced people during and after their displacement. In the short term, we set about establishing evidence about the impact of different kinds of ‘income support’ programs, using an approach in which we worked directly with field agencies. Our two-pronged approach was to fund and support field agencies implementing a variety of income generating programs, then work with them to conduct impact research of mutual interest. We were particularly interested in understanding the possibilities for using microfinance services in displacement contexts. We also supported displaced people with scholarships and funds for training.

We focused on Africa,2 and worked with both local and international organizations including African research organizations. Our modus operandi was as follows. Using the Feinstein International Famine Center’s humanitarian network in Africa, we identified field partners who were well established in the region, familiar with the local context, and already implementing some kind of income support program—income generation, microcredit, in-kind or livestock loans, agricultural support or training. We contacted the organization and developed a mutually agreeable understanding about our work and how it would fit with their program. We then provided them with a program grant and technical assistance, and worked together to conduct impact research. We used a combination of monitoring and evaluation methods, much of it with the help of graduate student interns from Tufts University, who were placed with our partners in the field over three northern summers (June – August).

The AP is based on the following philosophical and practical premises:

• We select areas where there are great and unmet needs for livelihood resources, as well as real capacity for a positive and lasting impact. We work in three different types of protracted displacement sites throughout Africa
  o Camps (both for refugees and IDPs)
  o Urban settings
  o Rural settings.

• We work in protracted situations, not emergencies i.e. initial mass influxes of refugees where there are acute health and nutrition needs that are best met by experienced humanitarian assistance agencies. Most income support programs are set up after emergencies, and we seek to become involved at that time.

• We do not deliberately exclude men, but most of the people we support are women. Many group loan schemes are composed of women, partly because

---

2 We selected sub-Saharan Africa because this continent has the most varied experience with refugees and IDPs, and because it is more accessible and familiar to the AP management
women are more reliable clients, and partly because men often self-select out of the programs (loan amounts are often too small for their purposes).

- We recognize that it is a mistake to target displaced people while excluding the host communities in which they live and which often supports them. In many cases, the host community is as badly off as the displaced people living among them. Providing only the displaced with aid or livelihood resources is unfair, unethical, unsustainable and ineffective. However, in many host countries, refugees are physically separated from local communities by government policy that requires them to live in camps. Therefore, the Alchemy Project uses a dual approach: where displaced people live amongst their hosts, program resources are provided to both populations; where displaced people are separated and at significant disadvantages to their hosts, as in camp situations, resources are generally provided only to refugees.

The process of developing an effective strategy that combined research and direct support was slow and uneven. Working mainly displacement and conflict contexts meant there were operational hurdles and the need for constant adjustments and re-thinking. In 2001, the use of microfinance and other income support programs in humanitarian situations was a relatively new and under-examined field. Following the model of the Sphere Project, we built evaluation into both our field programs and the Alchemy Project itself and we were externally evaluated in March 2004, to assess the progress of our research.

The accomplishments of our three-year project are reported here. First we review our direct support for income programs and the displaced, then we describe our field research and the summary findings of this research. A more detailed discussion of the research is to be found in an accompanying paper, “Supporting Displaced Livelihoods with Microcredit and Other Income Generating Programs: Findings from the Alchemy Project, 2001-2004.” Feinstein International Famine Center, Tufts University. November 2004. www.famine.tufts.edu

---

3 http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook/nutrition.htm
3. Direct funding and technical assistance

3.1. Income support programs

We supported a mix of microcredit and income generation programs, most of which included a training component, which we broadly describe as “income support programs” or ISPs. Although the programs differed in their approach, most had similar goals:

- to provide displaced people with tools to become more economically self-reliant,
- to enable clients to augment existing humanitarian aid (such as food rations) and improve their living conditions;
- to prepare clients for durable repatriation by reducing their vulnerability and introducing them to concepts of credit and repayment.

Each Alchemy program grant was relatively small, usually no more than $10-12,000, and used primarily for loans or training for refugees or IDPs. The loans were in monetary form (microcredit) or in-kind (such as livestock or access to equipment). Monetary loans ranged from $20 to $500, and were made to individuals or more commonly, to groups. In addition, as a way to increase the supply of credit in rural areas, we supported community banks seeking to set up branches in small towns (Coopec-Imara bank in Goma, and CVEC in Foyet, northern Cameroun).

Our programs supported many livelihood activities, including livestock, agriculture, small animal husbandry (e.g. fish farms, chicken cooperatives), and small enterprises like barbershops, groceries, prepared food selling, shoemaking, crafts and furniture making. Training took the form of vocational training (clothesmaking, bakeries, bricklaying) or business skills development.

In the interests of experimentation, we also disbursed a small number of seed funds to individual entrepreneurs, to explore the possibility of directly supporting refugees without going through a relief agency. We took a deliberately ad hoc approach, relying on the judgment of trusted colleagues familiar with particular regions to recognize opportunities for directly supporting livelihoods initiatives. We gave these colleagues small amount of discretionary funds to disburse to individual refugee entrepreneurs as they see fit. They tracked the progress of the loan recipients as best they could and reported back to us.
3.1.1. Output 2001-4

As shown in Table 1, between July 2001 and December 2004, the AP directly supported more than 5,600 refugees and IDPs through:

- collaboration with 18 field agencies and two universities,
- with grants to 22 field programs and two universities,
- in 12 countries in Africa.

Table 1. AP Activities, 2001-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of Partner Agencies</th>
<th>No. Income Support Programs</th>
<th>Scholarship Program?</th>
<th>Workshops?</th>
<th>Interns (over 3 years)</th>
<th>Research sites?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Leone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 lists the countries and partner agencies. Those in bold are still being funded as of December 2004. Table 3 sets out these programs according to the agency implementing them along with AP grant information. In Appendix A, we describe the field programs in more detail.
## Table 2: AP Countries and Partner Agencies, 2001-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Partner Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sudan</td>
<td>GOAL (urban IDPs in Khartoum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO/ACCOMPLISH (IDPs and refugees in Southern Sudan, Terekaka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Services (IDPS in Lubumbashi and Kinshasa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BDOM (Angolan refugees in Bas Congo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pole Institute (IDPs in North Kivu (eastern region))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coopec-Imara community bank (urban IDPs in Goma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREDAP: rural IDPs in Masisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mozambique</td>
<td>World Relief and FCC (urban refugees in Maputo and camp refugees in Nampula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. South Africa</td>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Services (urban refugees in Johannesburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liberia</td>
<td>American Refugee Committee (IDPs in Morovia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Relief (IDPs in Monrovia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sierra Leone</td>
<td>American Refugee Committee: (Liberian refugees in Kenema)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Guinea</td>
<td>American Refugee Committee: (Liberian refugees in Nzerekore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed grants (Liberian refugees in Dabola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cameroun</td>
<td>CVEC (community bank in Noun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tanzania</td>
<td>CORD (Congolese refugees in Kigoma camps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kenya</td>
<td>ALDEF (IDPs in Wajir, in Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORDA (IDPs in Wajir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Uganda</td>
<td>UWESO (IDPs in Lira district)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Zambia</td>
<td>CORD (Angolan refugees in camps)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Alchemy Program Grants, Years 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International NGO (headquarters)</th>
<th>Country Program</th>
<th>Alchemy funded programs</th>
<th>Total Grants 2001-2004</th>
<th>Total est. beneficiaries 2001-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) (US)</td>
<td>DRC – Kinshasa and Lubumbashi</td>
<td>Funds were used to buy land for cultivation and equipment, such as sewing machines and ovens; purchase agricultural supplies (seeds, tools and fertilizers) and support a truck.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Kinshasa: 170, Lubambashi: 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa – Johannesburg</td>
<td>Small business microcredit program provided funds towards business loan capital for urban refugees in the Johannesburg area</td>
<td>$36,613</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Refugee Committee</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Business literacy, training and microcredit programs</td>
<td>$20,000 ($10K transferred from Liberia)</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ARC) (US)</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Funds used to expand ARC’s existing microcredit program</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Microcredit program and training</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Relief (WR) (US)</td>
<td>Microcredit program and training</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Microcredit program and training</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique - FCC (Fundo de Crédito</td>
<td>Microcredit program and training</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communitário)</td>
<td>Refugee Animal Husbandry – Chicken Coop project</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/National Partner</td>
<td>Range of Activities</td>
<td>Alchemy funded program</td>
<td>Total Grants 2001-2004</td>
<td>Total est. beneficiaries 2001-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDOM (Bureau Diocesain des Oeuvres Médicales) (Bas Congo, DRC)</td>
<td>Operational partner for Catholic Relief Services. Angolan refugee project in Bas-Congo. BDOM manages food and non-food distributions, medical and nutritional support, agricultural assistance, water, road maintenance</td>
<td>Provided sewing machines and materials for building ovens for bread making, as well as vocational training to support refugees in rural areas</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPEC (Goma, DRC)</td>
<td>Oldest cooperative bank in the Goma. Began in 1980 and has 2410 members.</td>
<td>Loan to bank to use for microcredit to urban IDPs</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Project Details</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDAP (N. Kivu, Eastern DRC)</td>
<td>Consortium of agriculturalists and pastoralists. They identify rural projects that need support in Noth Kivu.</td>
<td>Supported four goat rotating credit projects, designed to strengthen the household food security of both IDPs and returnees</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Started with 40, present number unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole Institute (Goma, DRC)</td>
<td>A local research organization in Goma that designs innovative programs aimed at decreasing conflict in the Kivus. Pole manages the CREDAP and COOPEC projects for Alchemy</td>
<td>A core grant to develop networks that support livelihoods in the Kivus; carry out livelihood research; and conduct regional workshops.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMPLISH (Action Comm. to Promote Local Initiatives and Self-Help) (Juba, Sudan)</td>
<td>A local NGO that supports the Mundari people of s. Sudan. Works in education, water/sanitation, income generation and veterinary service.</td>
<td>Grant to purchase a fishing boat for the community in Terekaka, a small village along the Nile. Boat used by entire community for transport</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Entire village?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVEC (Caisse Villageoise d’Epargne et de Credit) (Cameroon)</td>
<td>Community bank.</td>
<td>Microcredit loan scheme</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORDA (Northen Region Development Agency) (Kenya)</td>
<td>Local NGO to promote peace-building and income generating activities among IDPs in northern Kenya</td>
<td>Livestock credit to IDPs</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWESO (Ugandan Women’s Effort to Save Orphans) (Kampala, Uganda)</td>
<td>National NGO working in HIV-AIDS, with orphans, microcredit</td>
<td>Microcredit and training for IDPs in Lira</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDEF (Arid Lands Development Focus) (Wajir, Kenya)</td>
<td>Community based organization working on water and sanitation</td>
<td>Capacity building for IDP women in Wajir, organizing women into milk group to conform to hygienic standards and provide the women with credit facilities</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>Individual/Institution</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Total Grants 2001-2004</td>
<td>Total Beneficiaries 2001-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Grants</td>
<td>Jackson Basikania - Bunia, DRC</td>
<td>Provide salary for members of hospital staff working in conflict area of Bunia.</td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacy Andrews – Dabola, Guinea</td>
<td>Provide small enterprise grants ($50-$1000) to refugees Sembakounya Refugee Camp.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>Ahfad University, Omdurman, Sudan</td>
<td>Scholarships for IDP women</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAHA, Tufts University, Medford, USA</td>
<td>Scholarships for MAHA students</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wits University, Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>Scholarships for African refugees</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Technical Assistance

In addition to direct funding, we provided technical assistance to our field partners through workshops, field visits, program exchanges and the placement of interns.

3.2.1 Output 2001-4

We have a set of recommended program options, accompanied by a training module, which explains how microfinance and other income support programs and practices can be adapted for refugee programs. These recommendations are based on the following principles:

- microfinance and other livelihood programs should be specifically designed and implemented so as to take into account the security, policy and socio-economic constraints facing both refugees and implementing agencies;
- relief agencies should not attempt to provide microfinance unless they bring in technical expertise. In-kind loans (which provide small livestock or equipment), income generating or other kinds of livelihood programs should be implemented instead;
- impact monitoring and evaluation should be built into livelihood programs from the start.

These recommendations are expanded into a set of ‘Lessons Learned’ which is available on our website and through publications.4

The training module was tested at the FIFC Summer School in Montreal in September 2004, and will be refined further next year, in collaboration with ARC.

We developed a monitoring and evaluation toolkit for use by implementing agencies or researchers to gather data on livelihoods. The toolkit consists of:

- Impact Monitoring Strategy (Including a baseline survey, reporting mechanism, and data base format)
- Impact Evaluation Instrument (a structured questionnaire developed in collaboration with ARC)
- Training module (pilot to be tested next year).

The dissemination of these tools occurs through communication with our field partners and consortium, and during workshops.

3.3. Consortium Development and Workshops

We established a consortium of some fifteen donor and implementing agencies interested in promoting refugee livelihoods. The purpose of the consortium is to promote advocacy with donors and increase the dissemination of our findings, as a way to support

institutional change. Members participate in our workshops, help us develop Lessons Learned and best practices, and help us communicate our findings. See Appendix B for the consortium membership.

In order to advance our advocacy and institutional change agenda, and to strengthen our consortium, each year we hold workshops, either in Africa, intended for our field partners, or in Boston, intended for donors and NGO management. The field workshop brings together program officers and other field personnel to share experiences, program successes and challenges, good practice, and new approaches. It is an opportunity for field personnel to learn about what other programs are doing, to network, and to arrange program exchanges and site visits. The Boston workshop is intended for donors and management/headquarters personnel to learn about AP findings and research, to explore ways to advance livelihood programming, and to work on advocacy issues and ‘good donorship’ together.

3.3.1 Output 2001-4

By the end of 2004, we will have held three workshops:


Output from both workshops includes a CD containing bibliographic materials, Lessons Learned, and the Programming Toolkit. These materials are also disseminated through our website.

3.4. Scholarships

One of the most neglected areas of livelihood support for displaced people is in tertiary education. There are very few opportunities for refugees to continue their university studies or their professional training. In order to explore the usefulness of supporting university students, we provided scholarships for students at the following universities:

- **Ahfad University for Women,** in Khartoum (Omdurman), 10 students for three years, 2001-2003;
- for two African refugee graduate students studying at University of Witwatersrand, Forced Migration Studies Programme, Johannesburg. 2004;
- for a Masters in Humanitarian Assistance at Tufts University.
We hope (but cannot foresee the future) that this training will enable the student to return to Africa to teach or work in refugee organizations, as they claim they wish to do.

3.5. The Internship Program

The AP is academically based, at the FIFC at Tufts University, and in addition to conducting research, part of our mission is to recruit and train new personnel for the humanitarian field. Each year, we offer graduate students taking courses on humanitarian issues the opportunity to serve as Alchemy interns, and provide a small travel grant to each of them. The students are trained and then deployed to assist our partners with technical assistance, and to conduct field research. Interns are assigned to sites on the basis of their field experience, language skills, and match with NGO needs. In joining the Alchemy Project, our field partners agree to participate in our internship program by hosting the intern (provides lodging, office space and logistical assistance). In turn the intern assists with livelihood and program data collection, with program monitoring and evaluation, and with report writing and other tasks the agency might assign.

The internship program is now in its third year, and has been a beneficial experience for all parties. The agency gains a highly motivated graduate student, selected on the basis of program match, and trained by the AP before departure. The AP in turn is able to gather a much greater range of field data than would otherwise be possible. The intern gains a structured and hosted field experience, and the opportunity to do field research. For some, this research has been the basis for their Master’s Thesis, which in turn increases the AP’s scope of research. For example, Jeff Isen’s internship with FCC in Mozambique in 2003 enabled him to write his thesis on the problems of group lending for MFIs, using FCC’s program as his case study (see Bibliography).

The field experience and support we offer students through the Internship program, enables us to recruit among the best student talent. Their collaboration in our field research informs our university-based teaching through the development of courses and case studies. In 2004, our interns were charged with implementing a baseline survey and creating a data base for impact monitoring, as well as training agency personnel to follow up with the impact monitoring.
3.5.1 Output 2002-4

In three years, we placed 22 interns, most of whom furnished us with a high-quality field report, available on our website (see Bibliography). Their placements are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Programs where Interns were based, 2002-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCC, Maputo (1)</td>
<td>FCC, Maputo and Nampula (2)</td>
<td>FCC, Maputo (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS, Johannesburg (2)</td>
<td>JRS, Johannesburg (1)</td>
<td>World Relief, Nampula (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal, Sudan (1)</td>
<td>Wits Univ. (1)</td>
<td>JRS, Johannesburg (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS, Kinshasa (1)</td>
<td>Goma, DRC (1)</td>
<td>JRS, Kinshasa (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC, Sierra Leone (1)</td>
<td>CVEC, Cameroun (1)</td>
<td>ARC, Sierra Leone (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goma, DRC (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UWESO, Uganda (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aldef, Kenya (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORD, Zambia (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Field research on Displaced Livelihoods

4.1. Overview.

Our field research complements our direct support for field programs. Working with our partner agencies, our research explores how refugees and IDPs pursue livelihoods, the impact of income support programs, and which program interventions work best under different circumstances.

Most of our data were gathered by our interns during their summer placements. Before they departed for the field, they were briefed and trained in data collection (structured interviews, focus groups, and key informant interviews) by AP management, and received a security briefing.

We also worked with local researcher organizations and consultants to help us evaluate our programs. In this the AP fits with the FIFC’s mission to support and build research capacity in local organizations involved in livelihoods research in zones of conflict and displacement. African research institutions help us conduct field-based livelihoods research through providing local researchers and translators, logistical assistance for interns, and most important, local knowledge about how best to implement our research methodology. Our African research partners include:

- The Pole Institute, based in Goma, DRC.
- The Forced Migration Studies Programme at the University of Witwatersrand (Johannesburg).

We supported these organizations with research funds and scholarships.

Our research goals were to:

- Identify the kinds of livelihood options and obstacles that exist for refugees and IDPs in camps, urban areas and rural areas;
- Explore whether and how income support programs supported displaced people’s economic activities, and whether these programs reduced refugees’ dependence on relief assistance, and the need to resort to dangerous livelihood strategies;
- Assess and understand the wider social and economic impact of our programs both on our clients and on their communities, particularly concerning their security situation;
- Assess whether microcredit programs are feasible for displaced people, in terms of repayment experience and sustainability, or whether more traditional income generating programs (using in-kind loans and grants) are a better option;
- Use the data as evidence to make policy recommendations to donors and international aid agencies about the use of funds for income support programs in humanitarian contexts.

We collected data over three years, using different methods, from 12 research sites in 9 countries (see Table 3 for a summary):

- Consultant reports by commissioned external consultants: Goma (February 2004); Tanzania (January 2004); Guinea (April 2004);
- Annual NGO reports provided by our NGO partners (all sites, all years);
• Structured interviews conducted by Alchemy interns in 2003 and 2004 (as part of the baseline survey);
• Field reports written by Alchemy interns and the AP management (all years, most sites);
• some of the contextual material for each site is drawn from reports and news items through IRIN and UNHCR.

Our research sites are further described in Appendix C, where we group into camp and non-camp settings. Not all of our field programs became research sites.

4.1.1. Output

Based on our field research, we now have a set of data on refugee livelihoods that has been analyzed and written up, and will be available for wider use by researchers by December 2004. The main findings of this research are summarized in the next two sections, and fully described in an accompanying paper.5

This research is also reflected in a range of articles and reports put out by the AP, and written by interns, consultants, agency staff and the AP management. See the Alchemy Bibliography in Appendix D.

In the next two sections we summarize our findings according to our research goals, first looking at displaced livelihoods and impact of the ISPs, then making recommendations about the use of microcredit vs. in-kind programs.

4.2. Summary and Highlights of Research Findings

The population we studied is not representative of all displaced people in Africa. We studied only those who are in protracted situations, engaged in economic activities, and who are often the primary income earners for their households. We discuss our findings according to the types of sites in which our respondents live: in camps, or self-settled in urban areas or rural areas.

4.2.1. Livelihood Activities, Obstacles and Strategies

We began by exploring the kinds of problems facing refugees (we use this term as a shorthand to include IDPs), and the strategies they use to get around these obstacles.

Research Question #1:
What are the main livelihood strategies available to the displaced?

---

As expected we found that with displacement comes the need to change livelihoods. In most cases, there is no access to farmland (or rangeland for pastoralists), and displaced people are obliged to start their own microenterprises, since any form of employment except odd jobs (‘piece work’) is usually hard to find. Very few of our respondents had formal wage employment, and those who did found it mainly with aid agencies. In urban areas and refugee camps, few of those with professional skills, such as nursing or teaching, were able to utilize them, despite the need for these occupations in many host countries.

The majority of our respondents (90-100% in most locations) were engaged in informal sector-based small enterprises of some kind, often supplemented with wage work such as part-time employment with aid agencies (teachers or translators or program staff). In camps, many refugees obtained some cash income by selling food rations (often the only source of cash income) or with ‘piece work’ (day jobs) on local farms or households when the opportunity arose. If any cash from this work was left over after household needs were met, it was used to start a small business. But for most people, without a supplementary loan, there was insufficient income to start a sustainable business.

In camps where cultivatable land was available (usually obtained by UNHCR from the local community), refugees with rural backgrounds engaged in agriculture on a small scale, sometimes harvesting enough to sell in local markets.

We expected that some would want to migrate away from their current location to pursue livelihoods elsewhere, and that some would engage in illegal activities. However, as anticipated it was difficult to obtain accurate information on these questions. This kind of research requires a different methodology and deeper local involvement than we were capable of.

**Research Question #2:**
**What are the main constraints facing the refugees’ economic activities?**

We anticipated four types of constraints facing displaced people seeking to start or sustain small businesses or other economic activities:

- Security problems, including crime, and harassment by the local community or authorities;
- Lack of social and economic rights, especially freedom of movement, access to land, and the right to work;
- Access to credit and cash.
- Other economic constraints related to their location and refugee status, including isolation from markets and transportation difficulties, inability to obtain licenses, documentation and work permits, and lack of credentials, skills, and training.
Security problems, particularly crime, but also violent harassment particularly for urban refugees, occurred in most of our sites. For example, refugee shopkeepers in Nampula experienced harassment, and some even had their shops burned down. However, most of our respondents did not cite security as their primary concern in pursuing livelihood activities. They were much more concerned with finding start-up funds, and the obstacles confronting them in trying to grow their businesses.

These obstacles included the following

- **Access to credit and cash.** A widespread finding was that lack of credit and cash was the most significant constraint in pursuing a livelihood, particularly for those with small businesses. In all three types of displacement sites, traditional forms of lending such as credit groups and moneylenders are under-resourced or too expensive. Other sources of credit, such as MFIs or banks were virtually non-existent or unavailable to refugees. In most cases, the only source of credit was aid agencies’ programs, (or sometimes the aid agency personnel themselves, who would make personal loans to refugees).

- **Transportation.** Refugees in isolated camps and rural areas were burdened with transportation difficulties and the expense of getting themselves and their products to distant markets. Assistance with transportation was a valuable input from aid agencies.

- **Documentation.** Lack of work permits did not appear to be a widespread problem, since informal sector activities are by definition unofficial. However, lack of documentation did prevent people from accessing banks, either for savings accounts or credit lines. Refugees with skills were more likely to encounter documentation difficulties. Their credentials were not recognized, or they needed work permits to practice, which were difficult to obtain. Most of them ended up pursuing small businesses.

**4.2.2. Program Impact on Clients**

In analyzing the impact of the ISPs, we only used data from those programs that have been in place for six months or more. We measured the program’s impact in two ways. First we compared the client’s situation before beginning the program (baseline) and then again six months after participation in the program. Second, we compare the clients’ situation with that of a comparable group of non-participants (the control group).

**Research Question #3:**

**Did participation in an income support program enable clients to build a sustainable business?**

Participation in microcredit or in-kind loan programs enable clients to get a loan and/or training to start a business. We explored whether this participation:

- enabled the client to make her business sustainable, i.e. viable after six months,
- and/or enabled the client to expand or diversify the business.
For monetary loan programs, we measured these two indicators by using program data to obtain the number of clients that had successfully completion the first loan cycle (assuming it was six months or less) and progressed to the next one, and by asking whether the client had expanded or diversified her business. For income generating programs or vocational training, we explored whether participation had enabled the client to start their own business, and whether the business was viable.

We expected that outcomes would depend heavily on the quality and experience of the programs—their that were more experienced would have higher ‘success’ rates because they would be better able to select qualified participants from the start. While this was true—well established programs like ARC Guinea and Sierra Leone had high repayment rates—we also found that relatively new programs, like CORD Zambia and JRS South Africa, also had good repayment rates once their programs incorporated best practices. There was significant variation by program however, and it is difficult to report general trends based on our preliminary findings. For numbers of start-up business, repayment rates, and business expansion rates, see the accompanying research report.

Most programs believe that one of the best ways they can enable the sustainability of their clients’ businesses is by providing ongoing business support and training, and one of our strongest findings related to the importance of training. Many clients suggested that the training they received from the program was almost as important as the loan itself, and almost all our respondents (including the control group) expressed the need for more training.

**Research Question #4:**
How did participation in the ISP affect the household’s economic situation?

We constructed a multi-dimensional baseline measure of the household economic situation by asking questions relating to wealth, consumption, income, savings, debt, and access to aid. In addition, we asked respondents to place themselves on a scale comparing their situation with that of the rest of their community. Details of these measures, including our experience with trying to utilize them in our study, and the caution needed in interpreting results, can be found in the research report.

We hypothesized that participation either improve or worsen the household economic indicators, or it could have no discernible effect. For example, participation could enable the household to pay off its debt (or it could go deeper into debt), increase its savings, and so forth. We expected that ISP participation would overall improve a household’s economic situation, compared with the control group.

We found that, compared with the control group, and especially in urban areas, participation did improve clients’ economic situation, as measured by improved food security and household consumption. Measuring change in income was more complicated, and we do not have robust results. There is some preliminary evidence that clients had less dangerous debt (i.e. loans they are unable to service and that are causing them problems) than non-clients, but again, we need more evidence.
Compared with the control group, clients were more likely to perceive themselves to be better off than others in their community. This finding was backed up by the perceptions of community groups (focus groups held in some sites), that program participants were better off than others.

**Research Question #5:**
What other effects did participation in an ISP have for the refugee households?

We explored program participation effects on the client’s:
1. sense of dignity, self-worth and empowerment;
2. ability and willingness to leave the camps.

**Empowerment and dignity**
One of our strongest findings was the effect of program participation on clients’ sense of dignity and self-worth. Almost all clients reported feeling empowered from not having to be dependent on handouts (such as food aid), although many still require them. In all of our programs, most participants made statements along the lines of “I am no longer a beggar.”

**Ability to leave the camp**
Although there were some cases of clients leaving the camp to move their business to the nearby town, on the whole, most respondents in camps did not feel able to do this. In the camp they felt more secure, and were able to access aid resources that they would have to give up if they moved out.

**4.2.3. Program Impact on the Wider Community**

**Research Question #6**
What effects did the presence of an ISP have on the displaced community and the local host community?

Finally, through focus groups and key informant interviews (not part of the baseline), we began to explore the impact of the program on the wider displaced community, and on the host community. We explored whether the program was perceived to affect economic security (e.g. stimulates markets, created employment). We also wanted to see whether the program created security problems for the community, perhaps by increasing the likelihood of being targeted by criminals.

**Impact on the Displaced Community**

In general, among the displaced communities in our research sites we found a very positive view of the ISP, and the belief that its presence contributed to the wellbeing of everyone in the community. In some sites we were told that the IDPs who benefited from the loan would in turn provide for their neighbors.
In the unstable environment of newly arrived (or relocated) refugees or new camps, small start-up grants appeared to be a more appropriate intervention in a community with few assets and weak social networks. Small grants contributed to the rapid development of markets and the availability of goods and services in the new camps in Guinea, for example.

In assessing the impact of the program on both the household and the displaced community, it is important to recognize that a client (or “beneficiary”) is often the sole support and income earner for a substantial number of people (dependents) in the household, and even for those not living in the household. In some situations, such as the Lira camps in northern Uganda, we have seen that those individuals who do well (including those who gain access to loan program’s like UWESO’s), are ‘given’ extra children, including orphans, to take care of.

**Impact on the Host Community**

The small size of most ISPs meant it was unlikely that there would be any discernible impact on the physical security of the host community, either in terms of intra-community conflict and tensions, or in terms of the program attracting the attention of inimical forces (warlords, rebel groups etc). There were no reports of incidents where program participants were targeted, or where markets in which program operated were adversely affected.

There is some anecdotal evidence that ISPs positively affected the host community’s economic security by stimulating local markets by providing new goods and services. In Nampula, for example, high quality chickens became available as a result of World Relief’s Chicken Program, and this benefited restaurateurs in the town.

In camps, there were reports that the market stimulus created by new credit resources brought in traders from further afield, and enabled greater diversity of products to buy and sell. However, we did not explore this impact in our study beyond asking people about their impressions.
4.3. Using microcredit to support displaced livelihoods

In studying income support programs, and the role they play in supporting refugee livelihoods, we were particularly interested in whether microcredit is a viable program option. We conclude that it is, under certain circumstances. In this section we summarize some of the main qualifications and suggestions that emerged from our research.

It is widely accepted that it is almost always a mistake for refugee agencies lacking technical expertise to attempt to provide microcredit. Unqualified agencies that try to provide microcredit to refugees and then fail, or weak programs that promote bad practices, create problems for the refugees and undermine the ability of more qualified agencies to implement effective programs. Weak programs will also discredit the idea of using microcredit for refugees, leading to reduced donor funding. Industry experts emphasize that before attempting to provide microcredit services, agencies should have good track records in microfinance, and considerable technical support. Microcredit should not be treated as a short-term NGO program that will end when the funding runs out. Stopping and starting a microcredit program does more damage than good, and undermines the credit culture (that will hopefully replace the handout culture).

However, as refugee agencies search for ways to support refugees, situations arise where agencies without microfinance technical expertise do attempt to implement a microcredit program under less than optimal conditions. When this happens, programs can be improved if attempts are made to abide by best practices, and to take note of lessons learned. The following list is based on the recommendations discussed in our paper on Lessons Learned (see Bibliography in Appendix D).

4.3.1 Best Practices

1. Undertake to develop or bring in a MFI for the long term, which will serve the entire host community.

2. Separate microfinance services (loans, savings, training) from relief programs. Use different agencies if possible, or at least different staff.

3. First—build trust and familiarity between the implementing agency and the refugees. In refugee settings, before implementing a microfinance program, it is best to wait until the agency is familiar with the displaced community, and is working productively with refugee organizations, groups and leaders. For new arrivals, interventions should be relatively low risk until the refugee’s creditworthiness determined, and the likelihood of further movement established. With familiarity, the agency will be more confident about the degree of risk inherent in refugee communities, such as the possibility of repatriation. Familiarity will also give agencies more confidence about being flexible about loan requirements such as collateral. Until the situation is ‘right’ for microcredit, other kinds of livelihood support interventions are possible, such as in-kind loan programs (see next point), depending on the refugees' skills, available resources and the market.
4. **Livestock and in-kind loans are a better option than monetary loans in some situations.** In-kind loans or small livestock programs have less demanding repayment requirements and are more easily managed by relief agencies. Some refugee situations where in-kind or livestock loans are likely to be better options:

- in situations where the refugees are newly arrived, and/or there is insufficient familiarity with potential clients. Such programs might include a ‘starter’ grant, or in-kind loans for horticulture or animal husbandry;
- Where security problems make the presence of cash a risk, or where there are no savings or safe storage places to keep cash;
- Where agencies lack the capacity or experience to manage the complexities of monetary loans.

Livestock and other in-kind loan programs can help build collateral, rebuild livelihoods, and increase household food security. (Children’s protein requirements can be met with goat milk, for example.) Such programs can also prepare the client for participation in a microcredit program, by building familiarity and trust between refugee clients and NGO staff.

5. **Making loans to refugees will always involve special risks and problems. Loan programs should anticipate these risks and adapt the program design.**

In particular:

- Identify appropriate alternatives when there are missing loan requirements, such as collateral and legal documentation. **Collateral** could take the form of savings, or group guarantees. In general, innovative collateral strategies are preferable to no collateral, except perhaps for very small loans ($10 or less) which could require no collateral.
- **Adapt loan terms.** For refugee clients, depending on the business cycle, frequent loan repayments can strengthen the relationship between the loan officer and the refugee client. At the beginning, the shortest possible period is recommendable.
- **Loan size.** Agencies should not over-estimate the required loan size. Loans that are too big are more difficult to manage. If an agency has the capacity to offer larger loans, and the demand is great enough, it may be a valuable service, but large individual loans are more complex and demand greater capacity to manage than small or group loans.
- **Interest rates and repayment frequency** should be based on institutional cost assessment, inflation, market rates, risk and client capacity. In Islamic areas, where interest cannot be charged (because it is *haram*), service charges on the loan can be imposed instead.

6. **Where possible, agencies should provide a mix of services, especially training.** Refugees benefit greatly from **marketing assistance**, and pre- and post-loan business development **training**. Both microcredit and in-kind loan recipients can benefit from other financial services, such as flexible **savings** or **money transfer services**, which could help build the financial base needed to start an enterprise.

**Training** of individuals, loan groups and loan committees before loan disbursement is highly valued by group members, and increases the success of programs. While training
in business plans, accounting, and leadership are useful, refugees also benefit from help with understanding the local economy, refugee policies, how best to market their products, and social constraints they might face in the host community. Training packages like Start Your Business, can help improve business plans. Once loans are disbursed, there should be follow-up training related to business development. Workshops can be used to challenge and brainstorm business ideas, provide business advice, and encourage innovation.

Where possible, we believe it is best to separate training from the loan program.

Some ways in which agencies can support camp economies and provide marketing assistance:

- NGOs and UNHCR can purchase items for use in the camp, such as wooden furniture, soap, or food produced by the refugees, from refugees rather than from external markets.
- When movement outside of camps is permitted, refugees can be assisted with transportation to reach other market possibilities beyond the immediate vicinity. Transportation is a significant business constraint in most camps situations, and assistance could be built into livelihood programs.
- Alternative outlets for selling specialized refugee produce can be found. Agencies can help refugees connect with craft trading organizations, such as Tradecraft or 10,000 Villages, which take hand made crafts and other goods overseas to sell.

Microfinance and other kinds of income support for refugees represents an approach to poverty reduction and the kind of crossover programming that spans both relief and development interventions. It is a transitional type of intervention that can be used as a complement to traditional grant-based relief programs, as a way to support host communities, and, through cross-border programs, support reconstruction when refugees repatriate.
5. Future Objectives, Years 4-5: Continued Field Research and Policy Development

Our long-term goals are to work with humanitarian organizations to develop institutional programs and policies that support the livelihoods of displaced people. Such organizations include the various UN agencies (UNHCR, UNICEF, UNDP), and donor governments (USAID, DFID, ECHO), who are the future funders of large-scale livelihood programs of the type the Alchemy Project is pioneering. Alchemy’s mission is to communicate the knowledge and experience generated by our field research, as a way to improve humanitarian assistance programs and to ‘scale-up’ our own efforts.

Institutional change depends in part on relationships with UN agencies and donor governments. We are fortunate in that the Alchemy Project’s position in the Famine Center gives us access to existing relationships with some of these organizations (UNICEF, WFP, IFRC, the large INGOs). Our task is to enhance and strengthen these relationships through a process of dialog, visits, seminars and workshops.

Our objectives for the next two years are grouped into field partnership (research and technical assistance), and policy development and institutional change.

5.1 Field partnerships

The AP is well positioned to gather field evidence and data that can be used to support of institutional change. Between our NGO partners, our research associates and our interns, we have the skills, experience and network to implement innovative programs and conduct sound impact evaluation research, which in turn allow us to conduct results-based advocacy.

We hope to continue monitoring of the baseline survey put in place this past summer in selected field sites. Our objectives for years 4 and 5 are to:

• Place interns with our partner agencies for two-three months (summer break) to help track the baseline. These data will continue to underpin our program recommendations and technical assistance, and will be made available to other researchers, as well as contributing to the Livelihoods Initiative at the FIFC at Tufts University;

• Gather the updated baseline data from our field sites and incorporate them into our central data base at headquarters;

• Analyze and write-up these data for dissemination to donors and field partners.

Working in close collaboration with ARC Guinea (see below), we will continue to develop and disseminate technical assistance and program recommendations. Where requested, we will work with our partners to improve income support programs. Our objectives are to:

• develop a Livelihoods and Credit Needs Assessment tool;
• continue to refine our M&E baseline survey, and establish standards for good M&E practice;
• develop effective operational procedures and program options for livelihoods programs that can be adapted to specific displaced contexts;
• develop training modules for all of the above.

Where requested, we will continue to work closely with our existing nine field partners to assist them to find funding both for successful field programs and for monitoring and evaluation of those programs and baseline tracking. Funding will either be directly channeled from the donor to the agency, which will manage the funds, or can be managed by ARC, with whom we have developed an operational partnership. The AP will be subcontracted to assist with M&E, including establishing the baseline survey.

5.2 Policy Development

Institutional change is now a priority of other programs at the FIFC, and in years 4-5, the AP will also focus more closely on working with selected donors and international organizations to move the provision of humanitarian assistance in a direction that supports the livelihoods of displaced people and their host communities.

Our objectives are:
• Work with a small number of selected agencies and donors to ensure that impact monitoring and evaluation is incorporated into field programs from the start.
• Hold a ‘good donorship’ workshop to communicate our findings to donors, and engage in discussion about practice and policy change.
• Meet with senior staff in selected key organizations already known to us, to find a way to incorporate our findings into their policies and programs. These could include
  • DCI (Irish government)
  • ILO Geneva (SEED and WEDGE programme (Women's Entrepreneurship Development & Gender Equality)
  • UNHCR Community Services (Geneva and Regional Offices)
  • IRC (New York and selected field programs).

5.3 AP Management and Capacity.

The AP will continue to be under the guidance of the Director, Karen Jacobsen, who will have intellectual leadership and oversight of the Program, and will be responsible for initiation and control of research projects, relationships with donors and field partners, and the internship program. These tasks will constitute 30% of the Director’s time in Years 4-6. Field program management of funds will devolve to individual agencies, except in special circumstances where the AP is asked to manage funds. Where requested, funds can be channeled through ARC, which will take on monitoring and management of funds.
In Year 4, we will work closely with the American Refugee Committee’s Microfinance Technical Director, Tim Nourse, who will advise the AP about tools, ongoing research in the field, and best practices. He will serve as our special consultant in technical assistance.

In order to achieve these goals and objectives we will need funding to support:
- Management (Salary and travel for the Director and a part-time intern manager)
- Internships (travel and accommodation)

Field Programs:
- M&E costs (training, data collection and entry)
- Local research (translators, field transportation and accommodation)

Workshops (to support travel, costs).

5.2 Conclusion: a Word from the Director

The AP has benefited greatly from the work of our two Project Managers. We began with Tsering Gellek, whose devotion and commitment to the ideas embodied in the Alchemy Project, were a true inspiration to me personally, and to many of our partners, interns and colleagues with whom she worked. There were many days when Tsering worked tirelessly, long after everyone else had gone home. She was a cheerful presence, a good sport in the field, and a creative thinker, and she kept the Project running smoothly. Her departure for California after our second year was a blow, and she is still missed (but in regular contact).

Our second Project manager, Lakshmi Karan, picked up where Tsering left off, and brought her energy and technical skills to the Project just as our data base began to take shape. Lakshmi was, like her good friend Tsering, a cheerful and enthusiastic presence at the Center, and also gave generously of her time to data analysis after she moved to Minneapolis in October 2004.

I would like to thank our Research Assistants, Sarah Titus and Doreen Lwanga, for their hard work in the midst of the busy Fall semester at Fletcher, and the staff at the FIFC, particularly Rosa Pendenza and Jennifer Gatto, and Peter Walker. I have been lucky indeed to work with such terrific staff, and I thank them with all my heart.

Finally, the Alchemy Project would never have been possibly without the generous funding and incisive thinking of the Alchemy Foundation, and particularly Kyra and Coco Montagu. Many refugees, IDPs, partner agencies and interns have sent them their thanks over the years, and here I pass this gratitude, and my own, on once again.

Karen Jacobsen
APPENDIX A: Alchemy Field Projects: September 2001- December 2004

In the course of three years, we have directly supported more than 5,600 refugees and IDPs through:

• grants to 18 implementing agencies, working in 22 field programs,
• three scholarship programs, (two in Africa, one in Boston)
• three workshops (two in Africa, one in Boston)
• in a total of 12 countries in Africa.

These programs were implemented by a mix of international, national and local organizations. Table 1 set out these programs according to the agency implementing them. Here we describe them in more detail, by country (alphabetized).

Democratic Republic of Congo

Kinshasa area

Since the wars of the late 1990s, Kinshasa is populated by IDPs, returnees and refugees from all over the region. Many live in squatter areas or camps near the city.

Implementing Partner: Jesuit Refugee Services/Great Lakes  
Start of Program: March 2002  
Evaluated by Alchemy interns in 2002 and 2004)

Alchemy supported income generating activities like bakeries and agriculture. The IDPs’ ability to engage in agriculture was limited by poor transportation to fields outside town and markets. So our Year 2 grant allocated funds to help purchase a truck used by IDPs to transport their vegetables and finished goods to the city. The number of beneficiaries using this transportation service is estimated to be around 185.

Lubumbashi

Implementing Partner: Jesuit Refugee Services, Great Lakes

Alchemy supported agricultural and vocational income generating activities for IDPs. Alchemy funds were used for a fish farm.

Bas Congo

Bas Congo was for many years a host area for Angolan refugees. 
Implementing Partner: BDOM (Bureau Diocesain des Oeuvres Médicales) – Eastern DRC  
BDOM is the operational partner for Catholic Relief Services’ UNHCR-funded Angolan refugee project in Bas-Congo. BDOM manages food and non-food distributions, medical and nutritional support, agricultural assistance, as well as the provision of clean water and the maintenance of roads. 
Alchemy provided funds for equipments like sewing machines and materials for building ovens for bread making, as well as training to support refugees in rural areas.
Eastern DRC: Goma and Masisi

The region of North and South Kivu has been particularly hard hit by the prolonged crisis and violent conflict in the eastern DRC. In addition to being in the midst of this conflict zone, the town of Goma experienced a devastating volcano eruption on January 17th, 2002, when Mount Nyiragongo erupted, sending several streams of boiling lava through the streets of Goma and into Lake Kivu. Over three hundred thousand people were forced to leave their homes and the lava and the resulting fires wiped out most of the city’s business district.

Implementing Partner: Pole Institute
(Evaluated by Alchemy interns in 2002 and 2003; regional conflict prevented an intern from going in 2004)

The Pole Institute is one of the few recognized research institutes in Goma, and is also a trusted conduit for providing Alchemy funds to local organizations. Beginning in September 2001, and using the Pole Institute as our interlocutor, we provided annual grants to CREDAP, Committee for Reflection on Agro-Pastoral Development, and to Coopec-Imara, the only community bank in Goma.

CREDAP is a consortium of local veterinarians and agricultural specialists who work together to restart and sustain agricultural and pastoral activities in the Kivus. Alchemy’s grant was used in rural areas of Masisi, for livestock and agricultural income generating programs and focused on strengthening household and food security of IDPs and returnees from refugee camps in Rwanda and Uganda. In two years, 250 women have received goats. Each beneficiary is expected to take care of her goat, then, after the goat gives birth, pass one kid on to the next person in line, at which point the loan is considered repaid. Intern reports indicate over 95% rotation success. The cases where beneficiaries were unable to repay were due to death of the goat or when faced with abject poverty the goat was traded for material needs.

Coopec-Imara is the oldest community bank in Goma. It began in 1980 and presently has 2410 members. Its objective is to assist low income earners by mobilizing their savings and providing credit. Coopec-Imara was supported by Alchemy because, given the scarcity of formal banking institutions in conflict zones, we seek to support community banks of all kinds. Alchemy made a loan of $10,000 to Coopec, which was used to provide loans, averaging $500, to 20 Clients (16 men, 3 women and 1 women’s association). The loans were used to rebuild businesses that were destroyed as a result of the Mt. Nyiragongo volcano in January 2002. By August 2003, 9 beneficiaries had made their payments as scheduled. Some factors that adversely affected repayments were insecurity (looting/robbery); too few customers; poor transport infrastructure and high taxes.

Guinea

Ngerekore
Implementing partner and program: American Refugee Committee (ARC), Income Generating Program.
Program evaluated by an external consultant in April 2004.

As part of its IGP, ARC started its first microcredit program in Guinea in 1997, serving refugees from Sierra Leone and Liberia. A pioneer in the use of microcredit with displaced persons, with a proven record in Guinea, ARC has developed a model program that includes training in health and literacy, and on-going business support for its clients. According to ARC’s records, 93 percent of their clients’ were still in business two years after the initial loan was issued. ARC/Guinea has repayment rates of 96 percent.
Alchemy transferred support to ARC Guinea from its Liberia program (see above) after conflict there forced the program out in 2002. ARC’s microcredit program is a step-up one, in which vulnerable clients or new arrivals begin with a start-up grant, than progress to a basic loan and then to an advanced loan.

From January - August 2003, start-up grants were distributed in Laine camp to 483 women, divided into 231 groups in the first cycle of the grants (50,000 FG/group). Of these, 210 were eligible for the second cycle (also 50,000 FG). The other groups did not qualify for the second cycle because one of their members did not pass the eligibility criteria, i.e. retain at least 70% of the original grant in the business and reinvest 50% of the profits/gains. The total value of the start-up grants disbursed was FG 22,050,000 (ca. $11,000). Since new arrivals to the camp diminished in the second quarter of 2003, the start-up grant program was suspended there at the end of August.

The basic-loan program started in January 2003 in Kola camp, and on a smaller scale in February 2003 in Laine camp. In Laine, the loan program started fully from May 2003. In 2003, 1207 clients (232 groups) received a basic loan in Kola and Laine camps. In the first quarter of 2004, only 22 additional clients received a basic loan. Because of growing repayment problems in Kola camp and saturation of the market, disbursement of basic loans was halted there in October. The total amount of the loans disbursed in Nzérékoré-camps in 2003 was FG 125,313,440, of which 45% in Kola (100 groups) and 55% in Laine camp (132 groups).

In 2004, the programs' emphasis shifted to the disbursement of advanced loans for clients who had successfully reimbursed their basic loans. First advanced loans were disbursed in Kola camp in September 2003. At the end of the first quarter of 2004, 176 clients had received an advanced loan.

All start-up grant and loan clients received business training classes; in 2003 this amounted to 2000 persons. In addition business classes were given on the request of other NGOs to students of their vocational training schools and to primary and secondary school teachers and female teaching assistants. ARC estimates that in 2003 over 500 individuals 'non ARC/IGP' clients have been trained.

Alchemy also funded ARC’s program of economic literacy and savings mobilization. The program is divided into 2 phases: the development of training manuals, followed by training for 300 refugee women. As of September 2003, the program has completed phase 1 of the program, the sections covered are: enterprise management and planning; record keeping and inventory for illiterates; pricing and costing; and marketing.

Dabola

Seed funds were disbursed by a colleague in Guinea, who spent eight months (February to October 2003) in Sembakounye refugee camp for Sierra Leonean refugees. She disbursed $1,400 in 7 loans ranging from $100 to $300 to refugees. Some loans were given directly with anticipated follow-up by our colleague; other loans were administered through a local NGO working with our colleague. These loans had an expected repayment of 50% at the end of every month. The businesses were in clothing, coffee and snack shop, small groceries. 100% repayment and 2 men and 1 woman made enough profits to expand their operations.
Northern Kenya

Mandera Region
The Mandera region has high numbers of displaced pastoralists as a result of recurring ethnic conflict and regular refugee influxes from Somalia. In addition, cyclical drought and disease outbreaks every two years or so have caused serious livestock death.

NGO partner: Northern Region Development Agency NORDA is a local NGO that works to promote peace-building and income generating activities among internally displaced pastoralists and Somali refugees in northern Kenya.
Start of Program: June 2003
(Not yet evaluated by Alchemy)

Alchemy supports NORDA’s livestock rotation credit program. Loans are provided on the basis of sharing of profits and losses, since loans with interest are inappropriate in Muslim communities. NORDA selected 10 beneficiaries (5 men, 5 women) and each received 29 goats. The program anticipates that goat reproduction and trading will enable loans to be repaid within 1 year. NORDA also completed a business skills training workshop for all the beneficiaries in July 2003.

Wajir
Implementing partner: Arid Lands Development Focus (ALDEF) (local organization)
(evaluated by Alchemy intern, 2004)

Beginning in 2004, we supported a milk project that trained IDP in groups about hygienic handling of milk and milk products as a way to support their milk businesses. Some were also extended credit facilities.
Three villages, Gotade, Alimaow and Barwako, were selected as pilot project areas, and 35 women were identified as potential milk traders and were trained in hygienic handling of milk. The training was done in collaboration with the ministries of health especially the public health department and livestock production. Two sites were selected as good business propositions, and two milk shops were identified, renovated and rented by Gotade and Alimaow Villages. Both sited are on the two highways to Nairobi and Moyale respectively, where the concentration of people is high and there are many truck drivers on these highways. The third milk shop has just been established and the renovation of premises is already done. Three fridges were purchased for the identified milk shops, as were aluminum milk containers, which were purchased from Nairobi (two for each shop). The milk trader women also became clients of Aldef’s credit scheme. At their suggestion it was agreed that they be given a starting amount of Kshs 20,000

Liberia

Monrovia
Monrovia has seen the influx of people fleeing the war in northern Liberia since 1999. Many live in open shells and in cramped displaced shelters subject to cholera and other respiratory diseases.

NGO partner: World Relief and their local microfinance partner, Local Enterprise Assistance Program (LEAP).
Start of Program: February 2002
Not evaluated by Alchemy.

Alchemy supported credit and savings services to over 200 displaced people in Monrovia. Each client received a loan of up to $50.00 within a group guarantee system. Many women clients
speak of their ability to feed their children, and pay school and health expenses from their business profit.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active loan clients</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total loan disbursed</td>
<td>$ 14,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total loan outstanding</td>
<td>$ 6,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total savings</td>
<td>$ 4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average loan per client</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average savings per client</td>
<td>$ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment rate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Female</td>
<td>200 (85%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In June 2003, just after the 2nd Alchemy grant was received, the war escalated in Monrovia, temporarily halting the LEAP program. Program officers are carrying out an assessment to determine the full extent of the damages. The remaining funds will now be used to re-establish the program with existing or new clients.

**Mozambique**

Until 2004, most of Mozambique’s refugees were to be found in camps close to Maputo. In early 2003, the government of Mozambique decreed that all refugees in Mozambique must be relocated to Maratane camp outside the town of Nampula, about 1500 km north of Maputo. All refugees who chose not to be relocated would cease to receive any humanitarian assistance. The relocation finally occurred in late 2003, but many refused to move and remained in Maputo, choosing to live there without assistance.

**Maputo**

Implementing Partner: World Relief and Fundo de Crédito Communitário. FCC is the microfinance subsidiary of World Relief, which is the main implementing partner for UNHCR in Mozambique. World Relief, the only implementing NGO in Maratane, runs two income generation and livelihood programs: an agricultural program and an animal husbandry program. Evaluated by Alchemy interns in summer 2002, 2003 and 2004

World Relief’s **Refugee Integration Program** is funded by UNHCR and the Alchemy Project. There are two components to the RIP: a microcredit program is implemented by FCC, an MFI attached to WR, with programs in Maputo and Nampula; and an income generating program in Maratane camp implemented by WR.

Until 2004, Alchemy funded FCC’s refugee microcredit program in Bobole camp, which was close enough to Maputo so that clients could establish small businesses, such as grocery stores, used clothing stands, or hair dressing salons. FCC’s repayment rate in Maputo was and continues to be over 98%. Operational costs for the refugee program are nearly fully covered by the interest earned from the loan portfolio, but the overhead costs are subsidized by FCC.

In Year 1, Alchemy provided step-up loans for 32 clients through FCC’s program in Bobole camp. In Year 2, Alchemy enabled FCC to target poorer clients in the camp, while FCC negotiated the transfer to Nampula and tried to re-start the program there. By end-August 2003, there are 75 beneficiaries, whose businesses include grocery stores, used clothing stands, or hair dressing salons. All loans have a 5% per month flat interest rate for a total cycle of 4 to 6 months, repaid on a bi-weekly basis with the 5% interest rate calculated on the entire initial principle, regardless of what has been paid back by the client.
As of June 2004, FCC’s microcredit program in Maputo had 83 clients (24 women) with a total outstanding portfolio of US$95,015 and a repayment of 84%, representing about 3-4% of FCC’s total loan portfolio.

Nampula and Maratane camp
In late 2002, FCC implemented a microcredit program for refugees at Maratane camp and in Nampula. In the year that the program ran (through November 2003), the program gave loans to 271 refugee clients. Although it was first touted as a success, the program quickly fell apart as clients were unable or refused to repay their loans. On average, the repayment rate was around 25%. The program was stopped in November 2003.
In Nampula, FCC’s RIP clients numbered on X clients [and is currently in default??].

World Relief’s runs two IGPs in Maratane camp. One is the agricultural program, in which refugees are given seeds and tools to grow crops in allotted plots of land outside the camp. WR staff members provide training and technical assistance.

The other is the highly successful Chicken Project which began in late 2002. Refugees grow large flocks of high quality chickens at the camp to sell to restauranteurs in Nampula. WR buys “one day chickens” [day-old chicks] from Maputo and flies them up to Nampul. The refugees are organized into small groups, and each raises a batch of the chickens, which take 45 days to grow. WR provides the chicken house, feed, and medicine, and helps the refugees sell the chickens. After the chickens have been sold, the refugee group receives all of the profits, minus the costs and a 5% fee, which World Relief uses to cover the cost of purchasing the next round of chickens, for the next group of refugees.

As of August 2004, 9 cycles of refugees have participated in the project. Each cycle is comprised of a group of 5 to 7 refugees, making a total of approximately 60 participants. However the numbers affected are significantly higher because each participant actually represents a family.

Sierra Leone

Implementing Partner: American Refugee Committee (ARC)
Start of AP programs: 2002

Port Loko
Start of Program: March 2002
(evaluated by AP intern, 2002)

ARC’s microcredit program in the Kenema District was moved in September 2002 to Port Loko in western Sierra Leone. Port Loko is host to a large number of IDPs, refugees, and ex-combatants/military; all considered factors for the spread of sexually-transmitted diseases and AIDS. The Sierra Leone HIV/AIDS program, part of a regional consortium of NGOs, is based in Port Loko and shares an office with ARC’s microcredit program. Among the target groups for the AIDS awareness campaign are commercial sex workers (many of whom are IDPs and a small number refugees), and ARC offers them awareness training as well as microcredit loans.

In Port Loko, Alchemy supported loans to expand small trading, services and production businesses. Some of the clients were ex-prostitutes, who had participated in an ARC HIV/AIDS awareness program and entered the microfinance program to pursue new businesses. The idea is to enable commercial sex workers to support themselves through legal means, or at least reduce their reliance on dangerous sex activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of beneficiaries</th>
<th>81 (75% female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average loan amount</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average loan term</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment rate</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kenema
(Evaluated by Alchemy intern in summer 2002)

In 2003, the ARC moved back to Kenema to assist in the reintegration of returning refugees by providing new loans to clients and studying how microfinance loans jumpstart livelihoods once refugees return to their homes. 85 clients are targeted for this program with 75% of them women. Liberian new arrivals in the Kenema camps were also supported in the Kenema camps.

ARC/IGP began disbursing loans in February 2004 in three of the camps and disbursed to the fourth camp in March. They disbursed to 911 clients, 218 male and 693 female, over four months with one disbursement a month. At the time of writing, 506 clients have paid back at a one hundred percent repayment rate. Also at this time, they are not disbursing additional First Cycle loans. This decision was made as a precautionary measure with the potential upcoming call for voluntary repatriation. ARC/IGP did not want to disburse to anyone who might use the money to help him- or herself repatriate. ARC/IGP, however, may start disbursing these loans again towards the end of the year after the call for voluntary repatriation has been made and those people have left. The Start-Up Grants began in May 2004 and have disbursed to 490 clients since then. In July they disbursed the first Second Cycle loans to 192 clients, 40 male and 182 female, from a selection of the first group to finish repayment of the First Cycle loan. They will continue with another Second Cycle disbursement next month.

ARC/IGP offers training to its clients as well as the monetary loans and grants. Prior to disbursement clients attend a mandatory business skills workshop. The ARC/IGP staff was trained in the Making Cents™ program, which is a curriculum to teach adult business owners better business skills. There are four modules to the program. During the workshop the clients cover the first module. Clients found this workshop to be beneficial to them and requested further trainings.

South Africa

Johannesburg

Like many African cities, Johannesburg has experienced high inflows of refugees primarily from the Great Lakes, Somalia and Angola. These refugees, together with the large population of migrants from other African countries, are subject to xenophobia and harassment by locals and authorities alike. South Africa’s refugee laws, while not restricting refugees to camps, have been implemented in harsh and restrictive ways, including preventing asylum seekers from working while their cases are pending. With the right documentation, refugees are permitted to work, but like many of the poor in Johannesburg, work is difficult to come by and there is little humanitarian assistance.

Start of Program: November 2001
NGO partner: Jesuit Relief Services (JRS) is UNHCR’s implementing partner in South Africa.

Alchemy supported the Small Business loan program. This program was initially not well designed and failed to accomplish its goals, including repayment (only 10% in the first year). Technical assistance by Alchemy (including interns at the end of the first year and a visit by a
microfinance expert from FCC in Mozambique) helped JRS redesign the program and several changes were made in Year 2, which resulted in a significant improvement, including a repayment rate averaging 98%. Most clients (80%) engage in catering and clothing businesses. Other businesses supported by the credit are cosmetics, public phones, crafts, and carpentry and pest control.

Sudan

Khartoum
Khartoum has long been home to thousands, perhaps millions of IDPs from the war in the south and from conflict combined with drought in the west.

NGO partner: GOAL (Ireland).
Start of Program: November 2001
(Evaluated by Alchemy intern in summer 2002)
Alchemy’s project with GOAL in Khartoum was our first, and began when, in July 2001, Karen Jacobsen visited a REFLECT circle of IDP women in Soba Aradi, a township on the outskirts of Khartoum. REFLECT circles are based on a literacy training philosophy developed by the Brazilian educator, Paul Freire. In addition to teaching the women to read and write, the circles enhance group solidarity and create relationships of trust. Working with the REFLECT circle, GOAL and Alchemy developed a group-based program based on communal goat herd and other income generating activities. Alchemy supported 35 war and drought-displaced women from the south and the west of Sudan.

Income Generation
Alchemy helped a group of 35 women IDPs from Soba Aradi (a township on the outskirts of Khartoum where many IDPs live) purchase of a herd of goats, a spaghetti-making machine, and a donkey cart for $1,000. The overall objectives of this project were to improve the livelihood and food security of the women participating in GOAL’s directed literacy program, REFLECT.

Women’s Adult Literacy Program
In Year 2, GOAL used the funds to build a training facility and pay for teaching supplies (books, writing instruments and teacher aid materials) to educate 1850 women in literacy and small business skills. Part of the literacy program took place in the Omdurman Women’s Prison, where fifty women received literacy and numeracy classes in the REFLECT method. Many of the IDP women are in prison for brewing illegal alcohol. Empowerment and the acquisition of literacy and numeracy skills are seen to be possible ways to break out of the cycle of repeated offences and imprisonment.

Rehabilitation of the Fulla Fall Primary School
GOAL used part of its Alchemy grant to rebuild one of the few primary schools in Soba Aradi, and paid for school furniture, books, and teacher training.

Terekeka, Southern Sudan
Implementing Partner: ACCOMPLISH
(Evaluated by Alchemy intern in summer 2002)
ACCOMPLISH is a local NGO in South Sudan, founded in 1978 by a few members of the Mundari pastoralist community. The conflict in Southern Sudan has resulted in the loss of much of the community’s livestock. Without livestock a Mundari man cannot marry, he has no prestige and no power. A partial solution to their vulnerability, however, lay in the fish in the lakes and rivers around the town of Terekeka. The Mundari people traditionally have had
a disdain for fish and fishers, and the connection between fishing and restocking of livestock was not immediate. However, once community members realized that income earned from fishing could translate into restocking of lost cattle, the idea of supporting fishing quickly caught on. Alchemy Project provided funds to purchase the engine for a fishing boat that ACCOMPLISH used to assist in the transporting of fish from Terkeka to the markets in Juba.

**Western Tanzania**

*Kigoma camps*
Implementing Partner Christian Outreach for Relief & Development, CORD
Alchemy Program support: July 2003-March 2004
Evaluated by external consultant, January 2004

Until April 2004, CORD was UNHCR’s implementing partner for community programs in Tanzania, but after that UNHCR gave responsibility for community services to a Tanzanian organization, and CORD ended its program there.

In Nyarugusu camp, Alchemy provided loan capital for CORD’s small business (microcredit) program. 35 Congolese refugees form 7 groups with each group receiving a loan of approx. US$ 100. The loan is paid back at an interest rate of 2% over 6 months. Groups get loans in sequence, so that the next group in the queue encourages the group ahead of them to repay on time. A committee of 5, consisting of refugee representatives and CORD officers, supervises and monitors progress.

**Northern Uganda**

*Lira*
Implementing partner: UWESO (Ugandan Women’s Efforts to Save Orphans)
Start of AP program: 2004
(evaluated by Alchemy interns, 2004)

UWESO is an initiative by women of Uganda led by the First Lady Mrs. Janet Museveni to improve the lives of the orphan population in Uganda which has experienced a rapid growth due to war and HIV/AIDS. Today, Uganda is estimated to have a total of 2.3 million orphans. UWESO’s leading mission is “to improve the quality of the life of the needy orphans by empowering the local communities to meet the social, moral and economic needs of these children in a sustainable manner”. UWESO has offices in 14 districts in all regions of Uganda.

UWESO’s largest program component is the UWESO Savings and Credit Scheme (USCS) which was started under the UWESO Development Program (UDP) in 1996. Another major component is Social Development, which encompasses HIV AIDS Awareness as well as Apprenticeship projects for orphans. The USCS, are revolving credit, targets foster families of orphans and specifically on women as the main clients for its loans. According to the organization’s policies the clients are organized in groups of four to five. Up to ten of these groups form a cluster. These clusters meet on a weekly basis. During the meetings the committee, which is comprised of a cluster chair, a secretary and a treasurer, is responsible for collecting the weekly payments of loans and savings by its members. The first line of collateral for each client is his/her group while the second line is the cluster. Though the program is open to both men and women UWESO guidelines and policies require that at least 80% of all clients as well as the cluster chair and the treasurer are women. Moreover, the first loan disbursement requires that clients complete a mandatory training consisting of eight components: financial management, business skills, leadership, etc. This structure, slightly modified, was adopted for the micro-finance project in the IDP camps.
Through the AP, UWESO was for the first time able to extend its services to the IDP population in Northern Uganda.

**Western Zambia**

As peace has been established in Angola, many of the refugees in Zambia are preparing for their return. At the same time, since many Angolan refugees have been in Zambia for a very long time (some since the 1970s), many are seeking to stay and to become integrated into the local region.

Implementing partner: CORD, UNHCR’s implementing partner for community programs in Zambia.
(evaluated by AP intern, 2004)
CORD seeks to equip the refugees with skills and a credit history that they can either use on their return to Angola or as they integrate into Zambian society.

**Mayukwayukwa Camp**

Start of Program: July 2003

In the vocational training school in Mayukwayukwa CORD recruits skilled refugees to provide training and apprenticeships in exchange for inputs such as tools or materials. Once the trainees have successfully completed their apprenticeship they are given basic tools and materials to enable them to start in business. To date, training has been completed in carpentry, iron mongery, tailoring, basketry, carpentry and radio repair.

Alchemy supported a livestock apprenticeship scheme called the Paravet Training Programme. The program provides refugees with Para-Veterinary skills that will help them reintegrate into Angola (and will provide qualified people to help with national reconstruction). The Paravet training is supported with hired services from the Government Veterinary Department and related government agencies. Training will include basic animal production and veterinary strategies, how to control major livestock disease outbreaks including cross-border diseases, and how to set up a private veterinary practice.

Target beneficiaries are those in Mayukwayukwa who have the interest and capacity to undertake livestock breeding and training. Each Apprenticeship Scheme has 7 Members; 6 Learners and 1 Innovator/trainer. The apprentices choose an innovator/trainer who then attends a 3 week paravet course to become a trainer who will teach husbandry skills to the apprentices, assisted by the District Veterinary Officer. A rotating Livestock Apprenticeship Group is then started with members receiving a grant of breeding stock and some initial support materials such as supplementary food and medicines.

**Nangweshi Camp**

Start of Program: 2004

CORD developed its micro-credit program in Nangweshi in consultation with the refugee population in February 2003 as part of CORD’s shift from relief oriented program interventions to a community development oriented approach.
CORD’s microcredit program has three components. The first consists of training in capacity building for entrepreneurship. Prior to the start of the loan program, a training of trainers occurs. CORD’s Community Services Officer trains the members of the Loans Committee (refugees) in the ILO’s Start Your Business program. The Loans Committee then conducts Start Your Business training for all potential loan recipients who must attend the training in order to develop their business plans and apply for a loan. The second component of the program is short-term
monetary loans, and the third component is business counseling to individual clients and groups in order to build their self-esteem and awareness in business, as well as aiding the Loans Committee in the monitoring and evaluation of the loan program.

The scheme is structured to encourage repayment through community accountability and group pressure. Refugees wanting to apply for a loan form groups of 12 from their sections of the camp, and attend the five-day training in which the program details are explained and participants learn how to develop a business plan. After completing the training, the groups submit their loan applications to the Loan Committee which assesses the viability of the plans, and gathers character and business information from the Community Development Workers (refugees who represent each section of the camp). When a group’s application is approved, the group decides which 6 members receive the loan first. The first round loan is in the amount of 250,000K ($50) and is paid back in 5 monthly installments of 50,000K ($10) plus 4,500K ($1) interest. Half the interest goes to the Loans Committee as incentive for their work and the other half feeds back into the program. CORD developed an easy, effective and transparent accounting system for managing the loan repayments. Loan recipients make their payments to the loan officer in the camp and receipts for the transaction are filled out in triplicate. One copy is given to the refugee for his/her files, one remains on file in the Microcredit Office (with the Loans Committee) and the third copy remains in the books for CORD.

As of June 2004, 185 individuals had benefited from the loan. The total amount of loan money distributed equaled 46,250,000KW (approximately $9,250). 31,850,000KW has been recovered ($6,370) along with an additional 2,848,500KW ($570) in interest. The current total arrears stands at 2,850,000KW on the principle. The percentage of the portfolio at risk is 33% and the current repayment rate is 92% - down from it’s previously notably high rate of 96%.

**Northern Cameroon**

*Noun*

Although intense conflict has not occurred in this region, tensions between farmers and pastoralists, and religious (intra-Muslim) and political differences have resulted in incipient conflict and some displacement. The rural population is almost entirely Muslim with economic activities in agriculture, herding, and small commerce.

**NGO partner:** Caisse Villageoise d’Epargne et de Credit (CVEC), a local NGO, has been in existence for 17 years, running a community-based savings and credit program.

**Start of Program:** June 2003

(Evaluated by Alchemy intern in summer 2003)

Alchemy’ augmented CVEC’s revolving credit programs in the town of Foyet. We funded CVEC as part of our exploration of community banks and how they can be supported. CVEC is well run and thanks to the transparency of its operations has been able to avoid the corruption problems that are rampant elsewhere in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed # of beneficiaries</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan size</td>
<td>$50-$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average loan period</td>
<td>3-4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>2% per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment plans</td>
<td>Clients may select periodic payments or single payment at end of loan term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender breakdown</td>
<td>35% male, 56% female, 9% groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Alchemy Project Consortium 2001-2004

(In addition to our past and present field partners)

- Catholic Relief Services
- Concern Worldwide
- DIFID
- Foundation for International Community Assistance, Haiti
- GOAL
- HOPE International
- HODI - Zambia
- International Rescue Committee
- IOM – Zambia and Angola
- Irish Government (DCI)
- JRS – Zambia
- Mercy Corps
- Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
- Save the Children
- The Springfield Center (UK)
- UNHCR
- USAID
- World Bank

**as well as several independent consultants**
### Appendix C: Alchemy Project Research Sites, 2002-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>Location and Displaced people</th>
<th>AP Partner (Program)</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Nzerekore camp, Guinea; Liberian refugees</td>
<td>ARC Guinea</td>
<td>External consultant, April 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDP camps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: AP Reports and Publications


Master’s Thesis:

Workshop papers and reports
“Livelihood Interventions in Conflict-Affected Areas: Dilemmas & Lessons Learned” Alchemy Project Workshop Report, Tufts University, March 6 – 7, 2003


AP intern reports:
Elizabeth Buckius, ARC IGP in Kenema, Sierra Leone. AP Country Report No. 1, August 2004.


Josephine F. Lukoma, JRS Small Business, Johannesburg, South Africa. AP Country Report No. 4, August 2004

Anna Mecagni, World Relief’s Income Generation Animal Husbandry Program, Maratane Refugee Camp, Mozambique. AP Country Report No. 5, August 2004

Naohiko Omata, FCC Micro Credit Programs for Refugees in Mozambique. AP Country Report No. 6, August 2004

External Consultant reports:


Nathalie Gahunga, Evaluation of North Kivu’s Alchemy Project. January 2004