



Project: UTF/ALB/010/ALB

"RECOVERING AGRICULTURAL DAMAGES AND RESTORING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY"

---

# Impact assessment - Compensation grants component

Albania

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
Tirana, 2016



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2016

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org).

---

# Table of contents

Table of contents .....	i
List of abbreviations .....	ii
List of figures .....	iii
Executive summary .....	1
Affirmation .....	1
Background.....	1
Conceptual framework .....	2
Methodology and data .....	2
Results .....	3
Agricultural production .....	3
Compensation payments.....	4
Resilience building .....	4
Conclusions .....	4
Background.....	5
Agriculture in Albania and the flood affected regions.....	5
The floods in Albania and the affected regions.....	5
Aim of the intervention.....	6
Methodology .....	9
Conceptual framework .....	9
Quantitative research .....	9
Qualitative research .....	11
Results.....	12
Demographic indicators.....	12
Economic indicators .....	14
Agricultural production .....	20
Compensation payments.....	24
Resilience building .....	29
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	32
Annex 1 – Assessment Methodology .....	34
Annex 2 - Household questionnaire .....	38

## List of abbreviations

ARDA	Agricultural Rural Development Agency
EU	European Union
EUCPT	EU Civil Protection Team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GDP	Gross Domestic Produce
Ha	Hectares
HH	Household
IBAN	International Banking Account Number
IDP	Internally Displace Person
MARDWE	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Water Economy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PDNA	Post Disaster Needs Assessment
REU	FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia
WB	World Bank

## List of figures

Graph 1:	Gender of respondents
Graph 2:	Relationship of respondent to HH
Graph 3:	Head of household
Graph 4:	# of men and women/HH
Graph 5:	# of residents/HH
Graph 6:	% of HH with pensioners
Graph 7:	# of pensioners /HH
Graph 8:	% of pensioners in total population
Graph 9:	% of households with underage
Graph 10:	% of underage in total population
Graph 11:	# of underage per HH
Graph 12:	% of working age population
Graph 13:	Total population / type of income
Graph 14:	Women population / type of income
Graph 15:	Engagement per type of income and gender
Graph 16:	Share of households with unemployed
Graph 17:	% of unemployed in population
Graph 18:	Average unemployed /HH
Graph 19:	Unemployed seeking employment
Graph 20:	Economic situation in the last year
Graph 21:	HHs owning and renting land
Graph 22:	Average land owned/rented (ha)
Graph 23:	Land owned/rented cultivated
Graph 24:	Land parcels per household
Graph 25:	Ownership of land
Graph 26:	Land owners per household
Graph 27:	HHs involved in plant production
Graph 28:	% of population in plant production
Graph 29:	HHs involved in plant production
Graph 30:	Average size production/type (ha)
Graph 31:	Plant production consumed
Graph 32:	% of HH owning livestock
Graph 33:	HHs owning livestock per type
Graph 34:	Average # of animals owned
Graph 35:	% of animal produce consumed
Graph 36:	Extent of compensation
Graph 37:	% of damages compensated
Graph 38:	Value related recovery
Graph 39:	Satisfaction with compensation grant
Graph 40:	Spending of compensation grant
Graph 41:	Purpose of spending
Graph 42:	% of spending /type of investment
Graph 43:	Use of agricultural investments
Graph 44:	Decision maker for the spending
Graph 44:	Flood risk reduction options
Graph 45:	Suggested governmental focus for risk reduction
Graph 46:	Suggested focus/risk reduction
Graph 47:	Further assistance to improve their production

# Executive summary

## Affirmation

This report was prepared on behalf of FAO Albania by a team consisting of Dragan Angelovski (author), Vlado Pijunovic and Shpresa Arbi (Editors).

Our thanks for the excellent collaboration go especially to Aisela Beqir Aga, Fitnete Ballcaj and the MARDWE Regional Offices whose support and contribution was crucial for the successful realization of the research.

A very special thank you goes to the respondents who were willing to share their experience and to openly discuss their conclusions and challenges they face in their daily lives and opportunities.

## Background

Above normal rainfall of up to 200 mm in only three days, 1 to 5 February 2015 affected Albania's southeast and southern areas. About 10,000 ha of agriculture land were damaged in the regions of Vlora, Fier, Lushnje, Berat, Korça and Gjirokaster. Most of the damages were borne by the crop sub-sector, fodder crops being the most damaged, followed by damages to greenhouses for early production of vegetables and fruits (strawberries) and orchards. The livestock sub-sector has been damaged in a lesser extent, although lack of fodder in the coming months will negatively impact the animal productions.

The European Union, United Nations and World Bank have contributed to the post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA), which has been undertaken by the authorities in conjunction with expertise provided by the three organizations/institutions. Based on the Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA), the EU considered devising a flood recovery programme that goes beyond the mere restoration of pre-floods conditions and aims at a situation of increased resilience (reduced fragility) in terms of infrastructure, institutional and social implications. The underlying concept is resilience building and disaster risk reduction, translated in better early warning mechanisms and disaster prevention, strengthened infrastructures to enable flood protection and preparedness, and support to the most affected and vulnerable sectors of agriculture.

As a result, three components have been identified for an overall amount of Euro 14.9 million: (Component 1) Reinforcing infrastructure and flood control – Euro 6 million; (Component 2) Upgrading civil defence preparedness and disaster risk reduction – Euro 2.5 million; (Component 3) Recovering agricultural damage and restoring productive capacity – Euro 6.4 million.

The overall objective of the programme was to aid the post-disaster recovery of flood-affected farming households in the country, especially in the six most affected regions. Specifically, the programme aiming to:

- 1 provide compensation and investment grants amounting 6.1 Million Euro to at least 4 000 farmers and farming households and around 200 households/ agribusinesses in order to the support restoration of their livelihoods, help rebuilding back better and enhance their resilience, and
- 2 strengthen the agricultural advisory/ extension services to the agriculture sector needs.

During the processing of the claims the applicants to the programme were categorized based on submitted individual declarations of losses at the time of the damages and losses assessment. The beneficiaries received a proportional and capped amount (compensation) in order to help them

recover from the coping mechanisms they implemented to face the immediate post flood situation (i.e. indebtedness, destocking of livestock, losses in production, etc.).

The main expected impact of the project is rural poverty reduction, by enabling the poor rural people to restore their production and incomes, and strengthen their resilience to disasters.

The main expected outputs from the project were:

- post-disaster recovery of the agricultural production and incomes achieved, of the flood-affected farming households in the six most affected regions.
- technical assistance provided for development of procedures for distribution of compensation grants to flood-affected farming households

## Conceptual framework

This report presents an impact assessment of the beneficiaries of the EU Floods recovery programme – involving the residents of five regions in Albania, with a particular focus on rural people who were affected by the flood and who received cash compensation grants to aid in their recovery. The study measures the economic and social vulnerability of 16 386 residents (3 525 households), investigating their livelihoods and achieved development following to the exposure to shocks.

## Methodology and data

Based on the conceptual framework, assessment recovery indicators were defined (i.e. incomes, agricultural production, reinvestments, and disaster risk reduction strategies) and adapted to the specific situation.

A total sample for the assessment consisted of 445 interviews.

The actual sampling was executed in several different steps, starting at the administrative level of each area and ending at the smallest unit, in this case households.

Before commencing the interviews, FAO designed, pre-tested and adjusted the questionnaires, based on feedback and recommendations received.

Trained interviewers from the Extension Units of the MARDWE visited the targeted communities at different times of day. No age, gender or relation limit was applied to the respondents, apart from excluding underage persons.

The field work and data entry were conducted by the staff of the MARDWE. Quality control, data analysis and reporting were conducted by FAO experts.

For management of the data collection and analysis, a formally nominated and approved by Minister of Agriculture working group for Monitoring and Evaluation was established. Working group consisted of staff from relevant departments in the Ministry of Agriculture and ARDA.

The Directorate for EU Integration and Projects, Sector of IPA project and other Donors, led the process and was responsible for the overall coordination. ARDA was responsible for provision of the actual list of project beneficiaries to which assistance was disbursed. The Department for Agriculture and Livestock, statistical sector, was responsible for provision of baseline data for the analysis.

## Results

### Demographic indicators

The average size of the flood affected households is less than five persons, where men predominate, compared to women, by approximately 6.3 percent. A total of 40 percent of households have retired persons and 46 percent of the households have underage persons, with boys slightly outnumbering girls, in line with the trend in the total population. The underage population represents less than fifth of the population or below the national average for rural areas of 25 percent. The share of the working age population averages at 68.3 percent.

### Economic indicators

There are no households without any sources of income identified. On average slightly more than half of the population contributes to the household incomes. The share of the population deriving incomes ranges between one quarter and one half of the overall population.

Agriculture is the most important income source for most of the households, however less than one tenth of all farmers are involved in commercial scale/professional agricultural production. As such the respondents in principle do not consider involvement in agriculture as employment.

Agricultural incomes are followed by pensions evident in approximately one tenth of the population.

Salaries from regular work contribute to less than a tenth of the overall employment and are outweighed by recipients of remittances and social transfers.

Self-employment is source of income for a very limited share of the population

Unemployment is a significant constraint, affecting almost 40 percent of all households. Unemployment as share of population hovers at one quarter of the total population or more than a third of the total working age population. Within the unemployed, less than one fifth of the female population is unemployed.

Regardless of the high unemployment less than a third of the unemployed are actually looking for employment.

Developments in the economic situation over the last 12 months show that for more than half of the households the socio-economic situation has remained stagnant. The economic situation has improved for one fifth of the households.

### Agricultural production

The results confirm that almost all of the respondent households own and cultivate agricultural land. The project beneficiaries on average reported 0.35 hectares of land flooded, or 21.8 percent compared to the average of land owned.

Severe fragmentation of the land is evident with on average four plots per household and with average land plot size ranging between 0.25 and 0.7 ha. The land parcels in vast majority of cases are co-owned by men and women.

Vast majority of households and slightly more than half of the target population are engaged in plant production, with men involved in slightly more households compared to women.

Most of the land is planted with combinable crops which require limited investments and labour input. Slightly more than third of the households are producing multiannual cash crops (orchards and vineyards), and slightly more than a quarter of the households produces vegetables.

Vast majority of the respondents are subsistence farmers who mainly produce crops for their own consumption and for occasional and regular sales.

More than half of the respondents own livestock (mostly poultry and/or cattle), and a quarter owns small ruminants. The small number of animals owned implies subsistence animal rearing, with at least 70 percent of their produce is consumed within a household.



### **Compensation payments**

One quarter of the beneficiaries confirmed that their damages and losses have been fully compensated. The remaining respondents quoted partial compensation averaging at 40 percent of their damages and losses. Less than one percent of the respondents consider the compensation amount as negligible.

Combined with the respondents which confirmed full compensation of their damages and losses, the project beneficiaries have evaluated the compensation contribution at over half of their overall losses.

One third of the respondents since the disaster, managed to recover to pre-disaster levels and half of the respondents achieved partial recovery. The share of respondents which considered their recovery to be low to none is evaluated at 13 percent.

The majority of the respondents are moderately satisfied with the compensation, with quarter of the respondents overall being very satisfied. 15 percent of the respondents are not at all satisfied with the support received.

The respondents within three months of the receipt have fully spent the transferred amount mostly on agricultural investments. Most of the respondents invested almost the full amount in agricultural production or "other" investments. In contrast, the average amount spent on home improvements accounted for half of the compensation value received.

### **Resilience building**

Vast majority of the respondents consider that only investments in public infrastructure (drainage, flood defence) can realistically reduce the level of risk from flooding. While a significant share is sceptical that solution to their exposure to flood risks can be found.

Vast majority of the respondents consider that investment support for their agricultural production can help them develop their production. The second most preferred assistance is training and knowledge transfer, which would complement the investment support provided.

## **Conclusions**

- The compensation amount in general was appraised as fair, both by the farmers and the local level stakeholders.
- The program has achieved the output of re-establishing the livelihoods of the affected households and recovery of agricultural production, as most of the population recovered their agricultural activities, with almost all of the households using their agricultural land
- Timing of this recovery intervention was appropriate in terms of the agricultural calendar, however belated for addressing the most urgent needs of the population in the aftermath of the floods.
- The primary Cash Transfer Mechanism has been practical for efficient delivery of the cash grants, and allowed for the disbursement to be implemented in a timely and cohesive manner.
- Gender inequality is limited in most communities, with relatively satisfactory levels of female participation in the process and decision making. However, improvements are still achievable and mandated.
- Multiple layers of management has influenced to some extent the timely delivery of the program. However considering that this was a first attempt coupled with capacity development prerequisites, the overall result and experience can be considered as positive.
- Most of the respondents face challenges in development of their agricultural production. Many producers rely on extensive practices, which ultimately erode their productivity and resilience.

As the emphasis of the program was reestablishment on agricultural activities, it yielded limited results towards development and improved resilience.

## Background

### **Agriculture in Albania and the flood affected regions**

Although decreasing over the past years, the contribution of the agriculture to GDP is estimated at 19 percent. The growth rate of agriculture production during the last five years is estimated to about 4 percent per year. Agriculture and related industries play an important socio-economic role, providing food and employment to the population. For the 46.3 percent habitants living in rural areas, agriculture constitutes the main source of income and agriculture employed 45 percent of the total employed population in 2014. This is especially important for women: 54 per cent of all active women in Albania work in agriculture, and 87 percent of those do so as unpaid family workers<sup>1</sup>.

The agriculture sector is characterized by small farm holding and fragmented land. The total number of farms is approximately 450,000 farms. The average size of household farms is 1.3 ha split into an average of 4.5 plots. Most of the farm holders are male with only 7 percent of woman-headed farm holdings. Around 53 percent of farms used tractors, the remaining 47 percent using manual work or animal draught power by order of importance.

### **The floods in Albania and the affected regions**

Above normal rainfall of up to 200 mm in only three days between 1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> of February 2015 affected Albania's southeast and southern areas. The most affected areas are located along Vjosa, Drino, Osum and Gjanica river basins, where river embankments breached and particularly affected drainage and irrigation areas. A total of 12,225 ha of arable land were inundated, out of which, almost 10,000 ha of agricultural land was damaged by the floods, affecting 15,000 farming households.

In the flooded areas, the overall agriculture area covers 137,666 ha. Cereals and open field crops, including fodder crops, are the main types of crop (72.5 percent of total planted land), followed by orchards (25%), vineyards, medicinal and aromatic plants, and greenhouses. The livestock sub-sector is dominated by poultry, followed by order of importance by small ruminants, beehives, cattle and pigs.

The total impact of the disaster on the Agriculture Sector is estimated at 2,55 Billion Lek (18.22 Million Euros), exclusively to the private sector and comprising of 1,19 Billion Lek (8.57 Million Euro) in damages and 1,35 Billion Lek (9.65 Million Euro) of losses. Most of the damages were borne by the crop sub-sector, fodder crops being the most damaged, followed by damages to greenhouses for early production of vegetables and fruits (strawberries) and orchards. The livestock sub-sector has been damaged in a

---

11 INSTAT (2015) Women and men in Albania:  
[http://www.instat.gov.al/media/295845/femra\\_dhe\\_meshkuj\\_n\\_shqip\\_ri\\_2015.pdf](http://www.instat.gov.al/media/295845/femra_dhe_meshkuj_n_shqip_ri_2015.pdf)

lesser extent, although lack of fodder in the coming months will negatively impact the animal productions.

The most affected Regions are Fier and Vlore, which account almost 75 percent of the total damages. Lushnje, Berat, Korça and Gjirokaster are also included among the most affected regions.

An EU Civil Protection Team (EUCPT) has been in Albania from 11 to 19 February 2015 to help the Albanian authorities in dispatching the supplies received, assessing the situation and providing recommendations to the Commission as to the needs and type of assistance required. The EUCPT preliminary assessment is that the Albanian General Directorate for Civil Emergencies lacks the staff and the capacity to manage large-scale adverse natural events. The emergency has been predominately managed at local level by Prefectures, which have mobilized various forces (army, police, Red Cross, volunteers etc.).

After the initial requests for emergency aid, the EU and other donors were called upon to help with the reconstruction efforts in the affected regions. The EU, UN and WB have contributed to the post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA), which has been undertaken by the authorities in conjunction with expertise provided by the three organizations/institutions.

The PDNA team has assessed in detail the situation in the field, looking at damages and losses in a holistic way. The PDNA Report estimated the damages, losses and immediate needs to Euro 110 million. The underlying reasons explaining the extent of the floods originated from the excessive rainfall, compounded by: a rapid melting of snow caps due to an also abnormal warm temperature, environmental degradation, intrusion and lack of appropriate watersheds management, lack of risk assessment in land use and settlements, and social vulnerabilities of the affected regions.

Based on the PDNA, the EU considered devising a flood recovery programme that goes beyond the mere restoration of pre-floods conditions and aims at a situation of increased resilience (reduced fragility) in terms of infrastructure, institutional and social implications. The underlying concept is resilience building and disaster risk reduction, translated in better early warning mechanisms and disaster prevention, strengthened infrastructures to enable flood protection and preparedness, and support to the most affected and vulnerable sectors of agriculture.

## **Aim of the intervention**

The Flood Recovery Program is a response of the EU in conjunction with other donors, such as the World Bank, under its water resources and irrigation programme (WB loan and grant from SIDA), with the objectives of:

1. immediate cleaning and rehabilitation of irrigation and drainage schemes – Euro 6 million - and
2. flood risk management in Vjosa river basin – Euro 3 million.

The project (Component 3) aims to deliver assistance to help rebuild livelihoods and to increase resilience of flood affected rural communities.

As its horizontal principles, the programme will apply the “build back better” and the “build back together” approaches within each locality, working together with local governments, local public institutions and communities to design and implement recovery activities. The principle of “building back better” will improve the pre-flooding condition of the affected dwellings. This will be particularly relevant for enhancing the disaster resilience of affected communities, including stakeholders along the value-chains.

The overall objective of the EU flood recovery Program is to aid the post-disaster recovery of flood-affected localities in Albania by addressing critical gaps identified through the Post Disaster Needs Assessment. The intended impact of the programme will be felt across a number of priority areas, to include housing, public services, infrastructure, and livelihoods.

In addition to tackling immediate country needs, programme priorities are expected to foster the sustainable growth of targeted localities and as such will exploit synergies with other more long-term development interventions.

Over the past decade, cash-based interventions during and after emergencies, as opposed to distribution of in-kind commodities, have gained in popularity. Recovery cash distributions also provide

opportunity for agencies to implement cash transfers and to innovate; firstly because of the ability to act quickly address the significant diversity of farmers, and secondly because in the affected areas the markets were not affected by the disaster.

The provision of cash gives the beneficiaries maximum freedom in deciding which items to buy and thus which livelihood activity to start (or strengthen). All items that the beneficiaries would need to buy with the grant could be easily obtained in the area.

The main expected impact of the FAO project is fostering rural poverty reduction, by enabling the poor rural people to restore their production and incomes and strengthen their resilience to disasters, through capacity development of the relevant stakeholders.

The project impacts are pursued through:

- (i) the production and incomes recovery of smallholder farmers and their improved resilience to climate related disasters; and
- (ii) the empowerment of government, and local authorities to sustainably and consensually manage disasters related to the agricultural sector and to build their resilience to climate change.

To achieve its objectives, the project was structured around three beneficiary levels:

1. Local and household-based agricultural producers affected by the flooding. In order to offset the effects of the disaster on households affected by the damages to agriculture, the intervention will work through a compensation grant allowing producers to restore their production capacity (e.g. restocking, replanting, acquiring/repairing equipment, etc.). At least 4,000 households will be assisted through the programme with a compensation grant; Special proactive actions will be taken to ensure that both women and men have access to these grants and to the decision-making processes.
2. Local producers groups, farmers and individual entrepreneurs, processors, collectors, etc., eager to develop investment activities, thus contributing to local economic development, along the flood affected value-chains or in order to contribute to the diversification of production activities in the flooded areas, i.e. collecting points, storage, processing, marketing, etc. Around additional 200 households/ agribusinesses will benefit from the investment grant to modernise or improve their production units. Proactive actions will be taken to engage women entrepreneurs, in line with the European Union acquis on gender equality, the priorities on gender equality set by the Government of Albania and the FAO Policy on Gender Equality. A minimum quota of women beneficiaries will be set.
3. Directorate of agriculture and livestock production within MARDWE, that include its Regional Directorates (extension services), NGOs, farming households affected by the floods, especially in the six most affected regions (Fier, Vlore, Lushnje, Berat, Gjirokaster, Korça). The project will primarily target the relevant staff in the Ministry of Agriculture at central and regional levels, municipal staff, local NGOs and existing producer organisations. These stakeholders are instrumental in sustainably restoring livelihoods and enhancing farmers' and rural communities' resilience as they meet the essential service requirements catered for at the municipal level.

One of the objectives of the EU programme is to support the capacity development of the MARDWE, or more precisely:

- Capacity building of MARDWE and ARDA staff on appropriate methodologies for design and distribution of compensation grants schemes, and
- Implementation of a post-grant monitoring, to assess the use and impact of the compensation grant on the farmer's recovery and resilience.

For the purposes of the project FAO developed in cooperation with MARDWE a methodology for calculation of compensation payments. The methodology is based on the following indicators: 1) incurred and reported damages and losses and 2) unified unit prices and yields for each crop/animal reported;

---

## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania

The MARDWE adopted the compensation methodology in March 2016, on basis of which 1) the farmers were categorized on basis of incurred damages and losses, and 2) the appropriate compensation shares and maximum (capped) values were set for each category of farmers.

The ARDA initiated the payments to the project beneficiaries on the in May 2016. The compensation payments reached the applicants by June 30th, 2016 (Administrative Order 02).

In July 2016 FAO in cooperation with MARDWE finalized the Methodology to be used for impact monitoring and during September and October 2016 implemented the research. Almost three months after the cash grant distribution and well in advance to the winter investment season the impact monitoring was conducted.

This document presents the results from the impact monitoring of the cash grantees in terms of recovery, expectations and vision for resilience.

Aiming to contribute to the assessment of results of the overall EU flood programme, this publication to the extent possible analyses various implementation aspects of the cash grant component, and extrapolates lessons learned in regional and national level.

The primary purposes behind this report are:

- To highlight the development achieved;
- To highlight the lessons learned during the implementation of the component.
- To provide ideas for policy-level changes in implementing programme of this nature in the future.

This assessment team consulted with immediate stakeholders such as local partners, beneficiaries, local government, and agencies engaged in implementation of the programme.

# Methodology

## Conceptual framework

The purpose of the assessment is to study and evaluate the recovery and development impact, status and needs of the flood affected population in the regions of Korçe, Fier, Berat, Gjirokaster and Vlorë.

The assessment analyses the livelihoods of the flood affected rural households, and it takes into account only rural households which had flood related damages and received compensation grants, regardless if they are farming households engaged in substance production or commercial farmers.

Based on the conceptual framework, the assessment indicators were defined, in order to allow assessment of the status and development of the household's agricultural production following to the receipt of the compensation grants.

This assessment considers the status of the surveyed households and tries to determine the overall recovery of the households following to the disaster. In particular, to 1) analyse their livelihoods, 2) assess the recovery achieved and any changes in lifestyles, 3) assess the appropriateness of compensation grants as recovery instrument, 4) assess the abilities of the households to cope with similar shocks in future, 5) the perception on possibilities for reduction of their exposure to shocks.

## Quantitative research

### *Level of reliability and sample size*

The assessment targeted the flood affected rural population comprising out of 3,525 households residing in five regions, as provided in Annex 1 – Methodology of the impact assessment.

The share of interviewees for the assessment was calculated on basis of the actual list of compensation recipients developed by ARDA.

Based on the following formula, usually used for socio economic studies in rural areas, the sample size was calculated.

$$\text{Adj. SS} = \frac{\text{SS}}{1 + \frac{\text{SS} - 1}{\text{Pop.}}}$$

In order to reach a reliability level of 95 percent in each of the target areas, the sample for the assessment consisted of 445 interviews.<sup>2</sup>

The obtained Sample Size (SS) was adjusted to the population size of the targeted area where the reliability was applied using the following formula<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Z = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95 percent confidence level)

p = share picking a choice, expressed as decimal (0.5 used for sample size needed)

C = confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g., .05 = ±5)

SS = sample size

<sup>3</sup> Adj. Ss = adjusted sample size

$$SS = \frac{Z^2 * (p) * (1-p)}{C^2}$$

The achieved confidence interval (also called margin of error) is 4.43 for the whole sample.

A total of 12.6 percent of the affected population was interviewed during the assessment, with additional key stakeholders interviews used for

verification of the results.

### Sampling methodology

The actual sampling was executed in several different steps starting at the administrative level of each target region and ending at the smallest unit, in this case the households.

- During the first stage a selection of municipalities to be surveyed (out of all affected) was conducted for each target region;
- During the second stage: communities were identified through purpose sampling (damages, size and representativeness), by selecting communities in each of the previously selected municipalities;
- During the third stage: selection of the households at community level was conducted, using combination of random and systematic selection.

The sample lists including both the names of farmers to be interviewed were provided to the regional representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture /Extension Agents. Prior to the start of the interviews, FAO designed the questionnaire, which was tested and adjusted, based on the feedback and recommendations received by the interviewers. All of the interviewers underwent training prior to the field work. The trained interviewers visited the target communities at different hours of the day, in order to capture both the residents venturing out of the communities and those remaining mainly at home. There was no age limit applied to the respondents, apart from the exclusion of underage persons. The field work, testing and translation of the questionnaire, interviews at household level and the data entry process, was conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture.

## Quantitative research

The period of data collection for the assessment was September 2016.


Quality control of the field work, data entry, process control, database clean-up, data analysis and reporting was ensured by FAO experts.

Both men and women were interviewed for the assessment. The share of the respondents specified by gender and target area is provided in Graph 1.

Men respondents outweigh women, as the interviewee names were sourced from the compensation lists, where men are traditionally listed as heads of households.

When the head of household was not present, a relative living in the household was interviewed.


The relationship of the respondents to the head of the household is provided in Graph 2, indicating that significant majority (77.8 percent) of the respondents were heads of the households or their spouses.



Pop. = population size

SS = sample size

**Graph 2: Relationship of respondent to HH**



In addi

## Qualitative research

In addition to the data from the direct beneficiaries of the compensation grants, the assessment engaged in gathering feedback from the regional stakeholders which directly worked with the compensation beneficiaries.

These semi structured interviews aimed to gather feedback which might be relative to the compensation recipients and could not be captured by the questionnaires, providing more understanding about the overall attitude of the respondents towards the compensation grants and enabling extrapolation of lessons learned for future improvement of the disaster support planning.

The feedback from the regional stakeholders is used to further elaborate and explain the results of the survey.



# Results

## Demographic indicators

The term household refers to all the members of a family sharing the consumption (sharing the same meal or eating together) on daily basis and contributing (directly or indirectly) to the income of the household through work, cash, or in kind.


The term head of household in Albanian context is not usually related to the ownership of assets and status of breadwinners, but rather to seniority and a role of representing the household. The role of head of household is traditionally assigned to the senior adult man, who usually manages the affairs on behalf of the households and as such it holds limited significance in gender equality terms. In this regard, the overwhelming majority of interviewed households have identified men as heads of households, as provided in Graph 3. Households with no response represent the answers where the interviewee was unable to assign the role of head of households to any of its residents.

Graph 4 and 5 provide the average size of the flood affected households, averaging at less than five persons.


The household sizes in Vlore region are smaller by 10 percent compared to the remaining areas.

The average number of women in the households indicates that on average men predominate, compared to women, by approximately 6.3 percent, in all regions apart from Berat, where women predominate by 11.5 percent. The most notable difference in the household composition is notable in


**Graph 3: Head of household**




**Graph 4: # of men and women/HH**



**Graph 5: # of residents/HH**



**Graph 6: % of HH with pensioners**



Vlore region, accounting for 12.3 percent in favour of men.

The steady decrease of the female population is evident since 2010 in the national statistics, however it accounts for a maximum of 3%, indicating that migration of women from the region might be in the rise.

The composition of the average household was further assessed by identifying the number of pensioners (over 62 years) of age and the number of underage persons (below 18 years of age).

The share of households with pensioners is presented in Graph 6.

A total of 40 percent of households have retired persons, with the share being highest in Berat and Fier (half of households) and lowest in Gjirokaster.

The average number of pensioners per household is highest in Fier (indicating that farmers are living in extended households) and lowest in Vlore (Graph 8).

It is interesting to note that in Korçe and Fier a significant majority of the retired persons live in extended families with underage persons; while in regions such as Gjirokaster and Vlore, significant majority of the retirees live with no underage persons in the household.

Overall 46 percent of the households have underage persons, with boys slightly outnumbering girls, in line with the trend in the total population (Graph 9).


The underage population represents less than fifth of the population (Graph 10), which is well below the national average for rural areas of 25 percent.

Vlore and Gjirokaster have the lowest number of underage persons, or close to half of the national average.


The overall impression is one of aging population with significant immigration and stagnating or reducing birth rate in the flood affected areas.

On average almost 2.5 children reside in the households with children. Fier and Berat regions have significantly more children per household in particular compared to the lowest ranked Gjirokaster. Significantly higher


**Graph 7: # of pensioners /HH**




**Graph 8: % of pensioners in total population**



**Graph 9: % of households with underage**




**Graph 10: % of underage in total population**




number of underage girls compared to boys is evident in Vlore (Graph 11).

The share of the working age population is extrapolated in Graph 12, and averages at 68.3%. The number of working age household members is significantly higher in Gjirokaster and Vlore, in line with the lower number of pensioners and in particular the higher number of core households which do not include pensioners or other extended family members.

**Graph 11: # of underage per HH**



**Graph 12: % of working age population**



## Economic indicators

Financial vulnerability (lack of sufficient monetary resources) is measured by the current incomes and employment, in particular diversification of both parameters. Poor households engaged in a single activity have fewer resources to cope with a shock and are more vulnerable to natural hazards.

Poverty indicators vary and include the percentage of people living in poverty, the depth of poverty and the poverty severity. Overall, in rural areas, households headed by women in particular with children are particularly vulnerable to poverty. The sample of the assessment indicates that among the total population there are 0.9 percent of such households, whereas half of them are women with minors.

## Incomes

Having sufficient incomes protects households against certain shocks. Yet, some shocks directly affect the earning power of households. For example, farmers whose production plots have been rendered unusable by a river floods, are very vulnerable, as they have lost not only the ongoing production or daily income, but also the ability to restore their livelihoods.

Having incomes from a stable sources offer more protection compared to working in the informal sector, seasonal employment or daily wages. Incomes from self-employment, agricultural production, or property (e.g. land lease), as well as informal transfers (remittances, transfers from relatives and friends) are considered as less reliable.

Households are considered more vulnerable if they have uniform incomes, no stable income sources, or if their incomes are exposed to shocks. The decision on which income source are considered as stable is conservative, and only formal wage income and old-age pensions are usually perceived as steady and its recipients are by definition less vulnerable.


The analysis of the data on the number of income sources indicates that there are no households without any sources of income.

The type of income, in parallel to the number of incomes and size of the household, is a significant determinant of monetary poverty.

The likelihood of vulnerability increases with the number of dependents in the household, and with the number of low incomes.

The probability of living in poverty is lower for individuals where a larger share of household members contribute with incomes from different sources, or if the household has income from regular sources.

The most important types of household incomes are provided in Graph 13. On average slightly more than half of the population contributes to the household incomes. In terms of household members contribution to incomes most active are the residents of Korçe and Gjirokaster with some 70%, or basically the entire working age population and part of the pensioners. Lowest contribution to incomes is notable in the household members in Vlore, with 40 percent of the population being economically active.



As the sample group included only beneficiaries of the grant compensation programme, all of the respondents are agriculturally active population. The results further confirm that overall agriculture is important income source for most of the households.

The assessment evaluated the shares of households and population deriving income from agriculture as well as the scope of their agricultural production, in order to approximate the level of importance of the compensation grants to the recovery of their livelihoods.

Pending on the region, the share of the population deriving incomes ranges between one quarter and one half of the overall population. Most prominent influence of the agriculture on the household incomes are noted in Gjirokaster and Korçe.


Pensions are the second most regular income source, providing income to approximately one tenth of the population.

Salaries from regular work have more impact for a significant share of the households only in Gjirokaster, while in the remaining areas households with incomes from salaries are outweighed by recipients of remittances (inclusive of other sources) and social transfers (welfare).

The role of women in the income structure is provided in Graph 14, indicating that:

- Shares of women deriving incomes from agriculture are identical as that of men and on average and in most regions, however women contribute to agricultural incomes somewhat less in Berat and significantly less in Vlore region.
- Somewhat more of the pension related income is contributed by women.
- Women contribute more as regular salaries compared to men in Gjirokaster, and somewhat less in the remaining regions and on average.


Detailed regional comparison of the structure of incomes between men and women is provided in Graph 15. The tables provide details on the share of population per scope of the agricultural production both on average and in each region.




Analysis of the data per region and comparison between regions indicates that:

- The agricultural production in Korçe is exclusively subsistence oriented with occasional sales of agriculture products. On the other hand Vlorë and Berat have a majority of producers relying on regular sales of agricultural products. Women are more involved in subsistence production, with limited contribution to commercial level production, which is influenced by the regional differences in types of agricultural crops produced.
- On average less than one tenth of all farmers is involved in commercial scale/professional agricultural production, with the share being strikingly high in Gjirokaster and surpassing one third of all farmers. The share of women involved in commercial scale agriculture is largely similar to that of men.
- Self-employment is source of income for a very limited share of the population, with Berat (followed by Gjirokaster and Fier) being the prominent with some tenth of the population. Self-employment is almost nonexistent in Korçe region. In all regions the share of women involved in self-employment is half of that of men.
- Seasonal work is relatively relevant for Fier and to a limited extent for Berat. In most cases women are less engaged in seasonal work.
- Full time employment or salaries are of limited overall importance, contributing to less than a tenth of the overall employment, and less than a third of that for women. Salaries as income are of particular importance for men in Gjirokaster and of limited importance for the women in Gjirokaster and women and men in Vlorë.
- Pensions are overall the second most important source of income contributing to the incomes of from a quarter the households. The region of Vlorë has the smallest share of pensions contributing to households incomes, with less than five percent of all households.
- Social transfers (welfare) are of very limited importance in most regions, with higher participation to both men and women in Fier. Social transfers are somewhat higher among women compared to men.
- Leasing of property is overall of very limited importance. However surprisingly it is of some importance for both men and women in Fier and Vlorë, accounting as income source to some tenth of the, beneficiary households.
- Remittances and other transfers from (in country and) abroad are of limited overall importance for both men and women on average, however of high importance for the households (men) from Fier and in particular for men, accounting as income for almost fifth of the population.

**Graph 15: Engagement per type of income and gender**



## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania




### Unemployment

Unemployment is indicator for populations exposed to shocks both in term of vulnerability as well as in terms of recovery potential. Unemployed populations in rural areas usually engage in agricultural production determined mainly by the resources at their disposal. When resources are limited, rural residents engage in labour intensive production, emigrate or often remain on the edge of monetary poverty. Natural disasters often affect agricultural resources such as land temporarily or permanently, limiting the economic activity of the population and contributing to unemployment.

The unemployment rates of the respondents are provided in Graph 16. The results confirm that the respondents in principle do not consider involvement in agricultural production as employment.

**Graph 16: Share of households with unemployed**




Unemployment is a significant constraint for the flood affected population in all regions, affecting almost 40 percent of all households. Vlore and Fier have highest shares of households with unemployed, while lowest are found in Korce and Gjirkaster.


Men are more unemployed compared to women.

Unemployment as share of population is shown in Graph 17, indicating that a quarter of the total population is unemployed, accounting for more than a third of the total working age population.

**Graph 17: % of unemployed in population**



**Graph 18: Average unemployed / HH**



Within the unemployed, on average less than one fifth of the female population is considered unemployed. However, in Berat and Vlore, a higher share of the female population compared to the average of the overall population is unemployed.

The average number of unemployed in households with unemployed is provided in Graph 18. The results indicate that households with most unemployed are located in Gjirokaster and Vlore. Households with the highest number of unemployed women are in Vlore and Berat.


To further differentiate between active and passive unemployed (e.g. housewives, people with health issues, students etc.), the respondents were asked to state the number of the unemployed household members seeking employment.

The data provided in Graph 19 confirm that less than a third of the unemployed are actually looking for employment, with significant variations in shares evident between the regions.

More than half of the unemployed are looking for employment in Fier, compared to less than an fifth of the in Gjirokaster and Vlore.


A follow-up question inquired on the reasoning for not looking for employment, to which approximately half of the relevant responders provided reply. Vast majority listed ongoing studies of young adults and in few instances, immigration and disability.

**Graph 19: Unemployed seeking employment**



The respondents were further asked to comment on the development of their overall economic situation over the last 12 months and to comment on the reasoning for the change in the situation or the lack of it. The results are provided in Graph 20.

**Graph 20: Economic situation in the last year**



On average for more than a half of the households the socio-economic situation has remained stagnant in the last 12 months. Most stagnant economic situation is noted in Korçe and least stagnant in Fier and Berat.

On average less than half of the respondents provided elaboration for their situation, significantly ranging between regions. The most quoted reason was the stagnant level of income and agricultural production as in the previous year/s limiting their development.

The economic situation has improved for on average one fifth of the households; With most significant improvements affecting more than a third of the households in Berat and Gjirokaster.

On average more than half of the respondents provided explanation for the improvement of their situation. Most often quoted reasons for improvement of the situation are investments in agriculture (cattle, greenhouses and olive production), employment (in some cases additional employment) and emigration abroad.



The overall situation has worsened mostly in Korçe and Fier; however, the share of household with worsening situation has not surpassed the number of households with improvements. Areas with highest share of worsening situation also tended to provide highest shares of explanation on the reasoning (over 70 percent).

Most often quoted reasons are: increasing prices of agricultural inputs, unemployment, sickness, death, debts and credits, lack of markets (Vlorë region) and in several cases (in particular in Korça) loss of agricultural land on account of the floods or expropriation.

## Agricultural production

This chapter describes the results of the survey related to agricultural production in the flood affected communities. It aims to describe the agricultural activities and to evaluate their contribution to the household wellbeing (food security and incomes), further assessing the impact of the flood and the recovery possible with the compensation grant.

With agricultural production being mainly resource driven activity, the indicators mostly relate to availability and ownership of physical resources such as land and livestock.

Lack of physical resources contributes to the vulnerability of households, as no assets are available to be exchanged or utilized in case of need.

### Plant production


Plant production is a key contributor to the food security and to the rural incomes and integrally linked to land ownership and availability of land.

In order to establish the capacity for involvement in plant production the respondents were asked to confirm their ownership of agricultural land (including pastures). The results are provided in Graph 21 and 22.


The results as expected confirm that almost all of the respondent households own and approximately one fifth additionally rent agricultural land.

The sizes of agricultural land owned further indicate that the respondents in Fier and Gjirokaster own significantly more land compared to the remaining regions, enabling more significant contribution of agricultural production to the incomes; however, the flood affected population can only derive meaningful income only from production of high value and labour intensive crops. The significantly larger sizes of rented land


**Graph 21: HHs owning and renting land**



**Graph 22: Average land owned/rented (ha)**



**Graph 23: Land owned/rented cultivated**



## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania

mainly refers to pastures, and in few cases to arable land, thus on average having limited impact on the overall plant production.

The level of ownership of a land resources, in vast majority equals the level of use (cultivation) of the land, as provided in Graph 23, with less than 3 percent of households having any of the land idled. The findings confirm that the flood affected population uses the available resources to the maximum extent possible, as they cannot afford any land idling.

The region of Fier has the highest share of land idled, however considering the regions significantly larger average land plot sizes, the idling and resting of up to 13 percent of the arable land impacts the agricultural production in a very limited extent.

Land fragmentation largely negatively impacts the costs of agricultural production. However, in cases of surface water flooding the households' land distribution across different fields can increase the resilience as all plots are usually not flooded. This is further confirmed by the fact that the project beneficiaries on average reported 0.35 hectares of land flooded, or 21.8 percent compared to the average of land owned.


Graph 24 establishes the average number of plots on which the land owned is divided. Severe fragmentation of the land is evident with on average four plots per household and average land plot size ranging between 0.25 ha (Korce) and 0.7 ha (Fier).

The land ownership within the household is presented in Graph 25 and 26. The results indicate that the land parcels in vast majority of cases are co-owned by men and women. Only in the case of Berat region the land is owned by a majority of men. The arable land has the highest number of owners in Korce and Gjirokaster, while the lowest number of owners in Berat.


It is worth mentioning that the size of land owned per owner, largely mirrors the sizes of the average land plot in all regions, indicating that various land plots have different owners in the household.

As all of the interviewed households are involved in agricultural activities


**Graph 24: Land parcels per household**




**Graph 25: Ownership of land**



**Graph 26: Land owners per household**



**Graph 27: HHs involved in plant production**



## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania


the assessment assessed the share of households and the share of population involved in plant production. The results provided in Graph 27, indicate that majority of households are engaged in plant production, with the highest share counts in Vlore and in Gjirokaster.

In terms of gender based labour distribution, it is notable that men are involved in slightly more households compared to women.

Graph 28 illustrates that slightly more than half of the target population cultivates crops, with the highest shares of population in Gjirokaster and Vlore and the lowest in Berat and Fier.

The gender comparison indicates on average slightly lesser involvement of women compared to men, apart from Gjirokaster, where the share of men involved in plant production outweighs the share of women by almost two to one.

**Graph 28: % of population in plant production**



The involvement of the households/population in plant production directly depends on the types of crop produced, the level of labour intensity required and the mechanization and automation options. Feedback on the most produced crops, land sizes and contribution to the households' food security was collected.

The crop structure of plant production in the flooded areas is provided in Graph 29.

The results indicate that vast majority of households are involved in production of combinable crops (cereals such as wheat, maize, barley, fodder etc.), which require limited investments and labour input. Slightly more than third of the households are producing multiannual cash crops (orchards and vineyards), and slightly more than a quarter of the households produces vegetables.


In terms of regional distribution Korçe predominates with uniform

production of mostly exclusively combinable crops, followed by Vlore where only every fourth households diversifies the combinable crops with high value crops.


Berat, Gjirokaster and in particular Fier have quite diversified production, with every household producing at least one cash crop.

The average sizes of land parcels per crop group are provided in Graph 30<sup>4</sup>. The feedback indicates that combinable crops are of commercial significance only in Fier, while in all other areas they can largely complement the food security and occasional sales. Fier, Berat and Gjirokaster take the lead in land sized dedicated to high value crops, further confirming their predominance in regular and commercial sales of agricultural produce.

**Graph 29: HHs involved in plant production**



**Graph 30: Average size production/type (ha)**




<sup>4</sup> Feedback on sizes of land plots per group c

The contribution of plant production to household incomes and food security is presented in Graph 31, by indicating the share of agricultural produce consumed by the respondents.

The results confirm that vast majority of the respondents are subsistence farmers who mainly produce crops for their own consumption and for occasional and regular sales. The lowest share of self-consumption of agricultural produce is notable in Gjirokaster, while the highest shares are in Korce and Fier.

**Graph 31: Plant production consumed**



### Livestock production


Livestock production is a very significant contributor to the food security and at times to the incomes in rural Albania. Animals are mainly produced extensively, with relatively low feed conversion and productivity, and with matching mortality and disease prevalence.

The involvement of the respondents in livestock production is shown in Graph 32, indicating that significantly more than half of the respondents own livestock.


The lowest number of livestock owning households is evident in Berat, compared to almost all flood affected households in Vlore.

The detailed overview of type of animals owned is provided in Graph 33, indicating that on average close to half of the producers own poultry and/or cattle, while a quarter own small ruminants (sheep and goats). The highest share of poultry owners is notable in Vlore and Berat, while the lowest share is notable in Korce. On contrary the highest number of cattle owners is notable in Gjiokaster.

**Graph 32: % of HH owning livestock**




**Graph 33: HHs owning livestock per type**



It is interesting to note that more than half of the livestock producers in Gjirokaster own equids (horses and donkeys), which is indicative of work animals and low level mechanization of the agricultural crop production.

The number of animals owned cross-referenced to the number of households which own livestock, is a good indicator on the level of intensity of the production, as well as of the destination of the animal production (Graph 34).




The results indicate that the respondents on average own two heads of cattle, which implies subsistence farming. On the contrary the respondents own on average 43 heads of small ruminants, which is sufficient to enable regular sales.

The relatively large number of pigs owned by less than one percent of the livestock producers, indicates commercial level production.

Graph 35 provides for the shares of home consumption of animal products. The respondents confirm that at least 70 percent of their produce is consumed within a household.

The average low number of animals is owned is indicative to subsistence production, and the seasonally sold produce, which does not significantly impact the income of the average livestock producer household.



## Compensation payments

### Value of the compensation payment


The compensation payments for the flood affected farmers were determined on basis of the 1) size of agricultural production reported as affected, 2) the share of damage reported and 3) the average yield and farm gate price of the production reported as affected.

The cash values calculated and distributed to the beneficiaries aimed to cover for the full compensation of direct damages and losses incurred on the current production on account of the floods. The farm gate prices and the average yields were sourced from the national multiannual statistics. However, the compensation paid did not include compensation for: 1) damages to arable land, 2) future losses incurred on account on reduced productivity of both crops and arable and 3) losses on account of increased and additional production costs in the aftermath of the floods.

The following section elaborates on the perception of the project beneficiaries in regards to the value of the compensation provided and the results achieved.

Graph 36 elaborates on the perception of the beneficiaries when comparing their overall loss to the compensation value received. On average one fifth of the beneficiaries confirmed that their damages and losses have been fully compensated.

**Graph 36: extent of compensation**




There are significant differences between the regions. Close to half of the respondents in Gjirokaster and Berat consider themselves as fully compensated, compared to marginable share of the beneficiaries in Korce and less than 10 percent in the region of Vlore.

The difference in opinion is easily explainable when taking in account the crop composition per region and the fact that regional averages of crops are significantly different compared to each other and to the national average; however, the national yield averages used for calculating of the values of compensation for the most planted crops (cereals) are identical or higher than the yield averages in both Korce and Vlore.

It is important to note that overall a minor share (less than 1 percent) of the respondents consider the compensation amount as negligible.

The respondents further confirmed the estimated share to which in their opinion they were compensated. The results provided in Graph 37 indicate that recipients quoting partial compensation evaluated the compensation on average at 40 percent of their overall agricultural damages and losses. Combined with the respondents which confirmed full compensation of their damages and losses, the project beneficiaries have evaluated the compensation contribution at over half of their overall losses.


**Graph 37: % of damages compensated**



Highest compensation to loss rates were estimated by the respondents in Gjirokaster, and Berat, compared to the lowest rates in Korce and Vlore.

The respondents were further asked to confirm the level of recovery they achieved considering the value provided as compensation. The results provided in Graph 38 indicate that more than one third of the respondents within one year, managed to recover to pre-disaster levels, with more than half of the respondents in Gjirokaster and Berat achieving full recovery, and the smallest share in Vlore region.

**Graph 38: Value related recovery**



Approximately half of the respondents achieved partial recovery, with the highest share among the respondents in Vlore and the lowest share in Berat region.

The share of respondents which considered their recovery to be low to none is evaluated at 13 percent, with the value being lowest in Gjirokaster and Fier and highest in Vlore and Berat.

It is interesting to note that compared to the level of compensation, one quarter of the compensation recipients in Berat and Vlore quoting insufficient compensation for any recovery, on average listed that the compensation covered between half and a third of their losses.

Further analysis shows that 23 percent of the respondents in Berat and 56 percent of the respondents in Vlore, which did not recover their production, have not invested any of the received compensation in the agricultural sector.

Some statements of the beneficiaries seem subjective and based on the overall and not only the agricultural loss targeted with the compensation grant.

The qualitative analysis from local level stakeholders on the value of compensation shows that three quarters of respondents evaluated it as appropriate in relation to the damages incurred, and one quarter (Fier) identified it as generous.

Overall the feedback indicates that there are cases where farmers were not fully compensated, as all types of damages and losses were not taken in consideration for the calculation of the compensation value. However, the compensation provided is satisfactory and farmers are very appreciative, as this is the first time that support was provided, regardless of the recurrent flooding.

During the qualitative assessment the level of recovery of the damaged agricultural production was assessed as "partial recovery" achieved by three quarters of the respondents and as "limited recovery" achieved by one quarter of the stakeholders (Korçe).

The main reasoning provided for the overall impression of "limited recovery" was based on the fact that the compensation did not include all types of damages and losses for agricultural production (agricultural infrastructure, construction and equipment of greenhouses, arable land, etc.), rather than that the compensation was not sufficient to restart the production. In addition, farmers faced challenges to repay their loans in time, due to the loss of harvest, incurring additional losses. The unrealized expectation for the government to "freeze the repayment of loans until recovery" affected cash flows, as the farmers had to prioritize their investments and limit their recovery on account of repayment of loans and interests.


The main reasoning provided behind the limited recovery indicates that 1) part of the farmers were compensated late, 2) preparation of the documentation for compensation exposed farmers to additional costs in their time of need, 3) some farmers were not included in the compensation lists due to various issues related to the local authorities.

The respondents were further asked to comment on the overall satisfaction with the compensation payment and disbursement process. The results are provided in Graph 39, indicating that slightly less than a quarter of the respondents overall are very satisfied. With highest shares in Berat and Gjirokaster region, and lowest shares in Korçe and Vlore.

The majority of the respondents are moderately satisfied, with the highest shares in Korçe and Vlore. Finally, approximately 15 percent of the respondents were not at all satisfied, with the highest shares evident in Vlore and Fier, and lowest shares in Berat and Gjirokaster.



**Graph 39: Satisfaction with compensation grant**




*Use of the compensation payment*


The expenditure level of the compensation grant received is provided in Graph 40, indicating that the respondents within three months of the receipt have fully spent the transferred amount.

The purpose for which the compensation was spent is listed in Graph 41. The results indicate that the respondents have spent the vast majority of the funds on agricultural investments, which seems reasonable taking in consideration that the timing of the grant distribution coincided with the preparations for the winter sowing season for cereals and the investment season for cash crops.

**Graph 40: Spending of compensation grant**



**Graph 41: Purpose of spending**




The lowest spending related to the agricultural sector is noted in Vlorë, with more a third of the households spending the compensation amount on home improvements and more than 40 percent of the households covering other needs (food, house equipment, funerals, start-up of business, medicines, debts, family needs etc.). Similar situation is notable in Berat and Fier where more than a third of the households invested fully or partially in non-agricultural needs.

On the contrary almost all of the respondents in Gjirokaster and Korçe invested the entire amount into recovery of their agricultural production.

The evaluation of the compensation value invested per need is provided in Graph 42. Indicating that most of the respondents invested almost the full amount in their agricultural production or "other" investments. In contrast, the average amount spent on home improvements accounted for half of the compensation value received.




**Graph 42: % of spending /type of investment**



The respondents were further asked to confirm the purpose of the agricultural investments, in order to assess any development effects of the compensation payments. The results are presented in Graph 43, indicating that approximately two thirds of the respondents invested the compensation into recovery of their pre-disaster production.

**Graph 43: Use of agricultural investments**



Slightly more than one fifth of the respondents utilized the compensation payments to invest in additional production, enlarging or changing the scope of their agricultural production. A small share of respondents overall invested in improvement and modernization of their production (better seeds and pesticides, new cow, greenhouse) and other related investments (ditches, drainage, mechanization, embankment).

On regional level the flood affected farmers from Korçe and Fier mostly invested in new production (additional parcel planted, seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, animal feed), while the residents of Fier were most active in modernization and diversification of their agricultural investments.

### Time management

The timing of the compensation was addressed only through the qualitative assessment, in particular taking in consideration that: 1) the distribution of the cash grants was realized more than one year after the floods 2) part of the farmers faced further delays and 3) all parties agree that the timeline for disbursement of compensation grants would not qualify as emergency assistance.

However, just as important as the time of disbursement, was the timing relative to the agricultural cropping calendar and investment deadlines. Given that the disbursement was provided in early summer (April-June 2016) the farmers receiving the funds had the opportunity to invest in their ongoing production, as well as to invest in their winter cereal production.

The feedback from the regional stakeholders confirms that farmers involved in production of the predominant winter cereals and autumn production in greenhouses and strawberries, were able to cover their entire cost of sowing and cultivation. Farmers more involved in spring and summer crops

(vegetables and orchards) were able to cover part of their investments for the ongoing production and could have benefited somewhat more from an earlier disbursement of the cash grants.

### Information management


In regards to the scope and timeliness of information provided by the MARDWE and ARDA, the local stakeholders evaluated themselves as “reasonably and timely informed”. On basis of the information provided to the flood affected farmers in terms of: 1) status 2) compensation timeframes, 3) compensation calculations, 4) grievances and outcomes, the farmers were evaluated as “well informed”. The reasoning for this conclusion was based on:

- 1) Evaluation of damages by the local committees was done in the presence of the farmers and records shared ;
- 2) Damage assessment lists were published for each flooded farmer.
- 3) The methodology for calculation of damages was explained to all farmers requesting additional information;

Improvement results could be achieved with: 1) more regular updates of the regional stakeholders in particular on pending issues (e.g. current plans for damages to agricultural infrastructure, investment grants etc.), and establishment of direct information exchange between the state institutions and the local authorities, in order to reduce delays and improve response times.

### Decision making


The respondents were further asked to confirm who in the households made the decision on how the compensation grant will be spent. The results are provided in Graph 44, confirming that in more than three quarters of households the decision was jointly made by both men and women. Interestingly, in Berat region in line with the predominance of male ownership of land, the decisions in approximately two thirds of the households were made by men.



### Resilience building

Aiming to assess the perception of the respondents and the local authorities on building resilience towards natural disasters and in particular given the recurring character of most flood events in Albania, the assessment inquired on the options deemed possible and feasible by the compensation beneficiaries.


The respondents were asked to provide their opinion on ways to better protect their livelihoods from future flood events. The results provided in Graph 45, indicate that vast majority of the respondents consider that only investments in public assets and infrastructure can realistically reduce the level of risk from flooding.



A significant share of respondents in particular in Gjirokaster and Berat is sceptical that solution to their exposure to flood risks can be found.

Graph 45 identifies the proposals for resilience building suggested by the respondents, indicating significant consensus on among the respondents on regional level.

Majority of the population supports investments in flood defences on village and municipal level, as way of permanently reducing their exposure to flood risks.




The qualitative feedback from the local stakeholder suggested options for improvement of farmer resilience in terms of reoccurring floods, is provided in Graph 46. There is a unanimous opinion that resilience of farmers in the target areas can be addressed through investments in flood defences on municipal and regional level.

The majority has consensus that investments on farmer and plot/field level could also yield results, while only 40 and 20 percent of the respondents envisage reduction of the risks through investments in changes of production practices and crops.

The overall feedback is in line with the feedback of the farmers who also overwhelmingly have allocated the responsibilities for disaster risk reduction with the municipal, prefecture and state authorities.

The detailed feedback that the local level stakeholders give priority to improved management of drainage systems in particular in September and October (including transferring of part of the maintenance responsibilities to the farmers), as well as to maintain the river bed, and strengthening of embankments. Recognizing that major investments might not be feasible in all locations, further

**Graph 46: Suggested focus/risk reduction**



feedback indicates that flood plains might require changes in production practices and land management.


Farmer investments in accordance to associated risks are also advised, in an attempt to transfer responsibility to farmers when selecting location of instance for high value investments such as greenhouses.

Although early warning could reduce damages from flash flooding in particular of movable assets, it would be of limited importance for flooded agricultural land.

In order to scope the perception of the respondents on how their current production can be improved and made more resilient thus improving their livelihoods, the assessment offered asked for suggestions for improvement.

The results are shown in Graph 47, indicating that vast majority of the respondents are in favour of investment support for their agricultural production, which is well in line with the overall components and aims of the EU Flood Recovery programme. The second most preferred assistance is training and knowledge transfer, which would complement the investment support provided.

**Graph 47: Further assistance to improve their production**



## Conclusions and Recommendations

This report presented a comprehensive analysis of the post disaster recovery of a total of 3,524 flood affected households. It aimed to assess the use of the provided support and the development achieved.

Based on findings of this assessment, the following conclusions can be extrapolated:

- The compensation amount in general was appraised as fair, both by the farmers and the local level stakeholders.  
The program has achieved the output of re-establishing the livelihoods of the affected households and recovery of agricultural production. Local stakeholder's see the program favourably, with respondent's overall satisfaction with the cash grants and with the recovery achieved.  
Most of the population recovered their agricultural activities, with almost all of the households using their agricultural land.
- Timing of this recovery intervention was appropriate in terms of the agricultural calendar, however belated for addressing the most urgent needs of the population in the aftermath of the floods. The communities stabilized their immediate needs following to the emergency and early recovery stages, which likely lead to a higher compliance rate and investments of the full grant in agriculture.  
However the timeframe for reaching the program beneficiaries has been rather lengthy, with beneficiaries waiting more than a year for the program to start and additional three months to receive the cash assistance.  
The further delay for little more than 10 percent of the beneficiaries who experienced further delays on account of technical issue (missing IBANs, mistakes in documentation), only reinforce the need for streamlining of the support distribution process, planning and overall coordination.
- The primary Cash Transfer Mechanism has been practical for efficient delivery of the cash grants, and allowed for the disbursement to be implemented in a timely and cohesive manner. The cash grants were suitable and effective mechanism for transferring large volumes of cash into the communities. The approach of beneficiary self-identifying priorities is more organic approach to support compared to agricultural input distribution, encouraging multiplier effects in the communities.  
With a global shift towards cash based programming, and donors increasing favouring this type of intervention, now is an appropriate time for the MARDWE and ARDA to build on their experience and streamline disaster support procedures and processes.
- Gender inequality is limited in most communities, with relatively satisfactory levels of female participation in the process and decision making. However, improvements are still achievable

and mandated. Gender mainstreaming should be at the forefront of program design and implementation, in order to ensure that marginalized groups are included in interventions. Specific training on gender mainstreaming should be provided to all MARDWE staff involved in program design and implementation.

- Market research and setting of values/parameters (average yields and prices) used for compensation for should be well communicated beforehand to the beneficiaries of the cash grant, to ensure proper understanding and transparency.
- Multiple layers of management has influenced to some extent the timely delivery of the program. Coordination through multiple layers of communication lines (Local Authorities, Regional offices of the MARDWE, MARDWE departments, ARDA and back), before reaching its intended audience for action, represents a challenge. However considering that this was a first attempt coupled with capacity development prerequisites, the overall result and experience can be considered as positive.
- With 91 percent engaged in plant and 66.4 percent in livestock production, agriculture continues to be a safety net supporting the rural livelihoods. Agricultural production is subsistence oriented and fragmented, impacting the productivity and profitability of the agricultural activities.  
Most of the respondents face challenges in development of their agricultural production. Many producers rely on extensive practices, which ultimately erode their productivity and resilience. As the emphasis of the program was reestablishment on agricultural activities, it yielded limited results towards development and improved resilience.  
While this has been witnessed in small scale, mainstreaming of sustainable development will requires more significant investments and behavioral changes spanning over a longer period of time.  
It is deemed that the cash grant amount was insufficient for more significant development and resilience building, which should be sought through interventions such as the programmes' "investment grant" component, stimulating the growth of the local economy.

## Annex 1 – Assessment Methodology

### **Aim of the methodology**

The following chapter describes the methodologies and procedures to be employed for the monitoring and evaluation of the project impacts.

Capacity building of MARDWE, and ARDA staff, on appropriate methodologies, for compensation grants are an essential part of this methodology as it aims to involve all relevant governmental stakeholders in each aspect of the monitoring and evaluation process including, but not limited to: definition of monitoring criteria and indicators, implementation, of impact monitoring tools.

A post grant distribution monitoring will be implemented by MARDWE via ARDA; capacity building of the Ministry staff in charge of the post grant distribution monitoring on ad-hoc methodologies to measure the benefits and impact of the grants on farm recovery and development

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

For management of the data collection and analysis, a formally nominated and approved by Minister of Agriculture working group for Monitoring and Evaluation will be established. Working group will consist of staff from relevant departments in the Ministry of Agriculture and ARDA.

The Directorate for EU Integration and Projects, Sector of IPA project and other Donors, will lead the process and will be responsible for the overall coordination. ARDA is responsible for provision of the actual list of project beneficiaries to which assistance was disbursed. The Department for Agriculture and Livestock, statistical sector, will be responsible for provision of baseline data for the analysis.

Staff of Department for Agriculture and Livestock (extension services), is responsible for data collection and beneficiary survey on the field, as well as for input of the data in the respective database.

Working group for Monitoring and Evaluation will be responsible for:

- Defining the data to be collected and required for monitoring change in the input, output, result and impact indicators.
- Coordination and management of the collection of the data from a number of data providers (Extension Units).
- To consolidate and verify the quality of the data provided.
- To carry out additional data collection or to seek clarifications in case gaps in the data requirements are identified.
- To carry out any analysis of the data and to evaluate impact of project.

### **Defining Data requirements**

The project document defines the output, result and impact indicators. Monitoring and Evaluation has to be result based. Result template table will be prepared by Sector of IPA projects and other Donors. The selected result templates for expenditure, output, result and impact indicators will be provided in this framework, and will be discussed and agreed upon within the working group for M&E. The templates provide for the exact data to be collected and for the interpretation of data for quantification of data for each indicator.

A field test of the beneficiary questionnaire as well as the database and results template will be conducted in order to address any shortcomings of the envisaged process. Testing period should be end of July- beginning of August 2016.

### **Coordination and management of data collection**

Working group for M&E, as mentioned in chapter data collection and analyses on page 2, has clearly defined the data provider's (staff of extension services) in terms of collection and validation of data and the completion of their part (by region) database and result template table. The Sector of IPA

projects and other Donors define and provide beneficiary survey, to data collectors on the field, see annex 3.

Staff of Department for Agriculture and Livestock in five regions (extension services) will be the main provider of monitoring data. Also, extension services (each for their region) will be responsible for entering the data collected from the field into provided database from Sector of IPA projects and other Donors, this is crucial, in order to have unified entry of data and to have single database. After entry of data from field, extension services will send database with copy of beneficiary's surveys to Sector of IPA projects and other Donors for further processing and evaluation.

### **Sample size and methodology for beneficiary survey**

The sample for interviewing the households in regions was defined as 469 households or 13.3 percent of all households eligible for compensation grant. For the defined sample the confidence level for the responses is 95 percent, while the confidence interval (margin of error) is 4.21. In reference methodology for calculating sample size, see annex 4 and annex 5.

Starting point was list of compensation paid, prepared by ARDA. According to this list, total number of farmers is **3.525**, breakdown of beneficiaries per region see in table below:

Region	Number of beneficiaries	TOTAL amount paid/LEK
BERAT	472	117,093,095
FIER	964	136,380,988
GJIROKASTER	82	9,947,886
KORCE	1,340	33,073,297
VLORE	667	72,621,721
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,525</b>	<b>369,116,987</b>

Above mentioned data on farmers which compensated for different production in different regions, are based on the list of disbursed compensation grants. These data represent the most reliable data which are

available at the moment. It means the total number of farmers which use compensation grant is 3,525. Thus defined sample was a starting point and the following methodological steps were made:

1. For sampling in particular regions and mesoregions was used the percentage which reflected the participation of farmers from those political units in the total number of farmers on compensation list. By multiplying that percentage with the total number of 3,525 farmers, the absolute value of farmers in each administrative unit was calculated.
2. Sampling the number of the farmers in particular towns/municipalities within the regions was done in the same way. As a whole, the number of farmers of those administrative units and the percentage reflected the share of farmers from each town/municipality in the whole, were taken.
3. Since the interviewers have no official state methodology in place and cannot use that in their work, they will use the following criteria:
  - **First step:** an interviewer receives a list of towns/municipalities within the region with defined number of farmers which (s)he needs to interview.
  - **Second step:** for interviewing farmers, each list from region is split in a couple of units (= total number of municipalities from region). For rational result of that division, one rounds it is in a way that each unit contains 13,3 percent of the sample defined for that region. Within smaller units, the choice of interviewers is random, based on the table of random numbers. For instance, in one town an interviewer needs to interview 30 farmers. For the first unit, a person makes 13 choices out of 27 numbers. The same process is repeated for remaining units. In such way, a person derives farmers in which the interviewers will interview. However, it might happen that a selected farmer does not respond on survey from any reasons, in such circumstances, the interviewer selects a new farmer by increasing the previous one by 3. If the new farmer does not respond as well, (s)he repeats this process two more times.

A selected interviewer will directly contact a member of a farm who is familiar with the data on their use of compensation grant and ask him/her to fill the form (= questionnaire) with the necessary data.

### **Verification and analysis of data**



## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania

Within 30 days of receipt of the data from the field, the working group led by Sector of IPA projects and other Donors will verify that:

- All the data cells have been completed.
- The right type of data is entered in each cell
- There are no typing errors (e.g. decimal points)
- Data is in the expected range (e.g. hundreds rather than millions)
- Calculations are correct (e.g. additions and percent calculations)

Data providers from field, will be informed of errors revealed by the verification check and be given 15 days to rectify those errors or omissions.

The staff in the Sector of IPA projects and other Donors will carry out any analysis of the data provided in the monitoring tables which is required to complete the Monitoring and Evaluation Report. This will include an assessment of the extent to which expenditure and outputs targets have been reached. Common evaluation questions have to be considered during evaluation is described in annex 1.

Finally, the calculation of impact should adjust the observed impact on assisted beneficiaries, the amount of investment that would have taken place without the assistance and other indirect facts such as displacement and multiplier effects. Result table presented in annex 2.

### **Resources**

The chapter clearly defines the roles of each member of the working group for M&E; this is base to draw up resources needed to implement the impact monitoring. Human resources needed to carry out the

<b>Region</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Sample size</b>	<b>Person days</b>	<b># of person</b>
<b>Stratum 1 - Vlore</b>	667	103	7	3
<b>Stratum 2 - Berat</b>	472	97	7	3
<b>Stratum 3 - Fier</b>	964	108	7	3
<b>Stratum 4- Gjirokaster</b>	82	49	4	3
<b>Stratum 5 - Korce</b>	1340	112	8	3
<b>Total sample size</b>	<b>3525</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>15</b>

activities have been calculated on basis of an average of 15 questionnaires per person/day. Additionally support from eight persons from various institutions and departments will be enlisted as provided

in the breakdown below.

Human resources:

- For data collection on the field and entry data into database, 15 persons/enumerators from Ministry of Agriculture, Department for Agriculture and Livestock (extension services) are needed;
- For analysis of data collected on the field, two persons from Ministry of Agriculture, Sector for IPA projects and other donors has to be involved;
- For preparation of beneficiary data, one person from ARDA have to be involved;
- For preparation of baseline data, 1 person from Ministry of Agriculture, Department for Agriculture and Livestock are needed (statistical sector);
- Four staff of the FAO project will support the whole process;

Financial resources needed to support whole process, are:

- Training of 15 interviewers (extension services staff) on how to use forms for data collection on the field and how to enter collected data into database;
- Creation of database, analyses and production of impact report;

### **Timing**

M&E report has to be conducted after cash grants disbursement, it is recommended to do beneficiary survey twice, first time in period September-November 2016, to monitor use of compensation received. Second survey and evaluation should be in period April-June 2017 to see results of compensation.

### **Reporting**

---

## Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania

At the end of the monitoring the Sector of IPA projects and other Donors, supported with FAO project, will draw up monitoring and evaluation report that shows for each activity:

- the actual number of beneficiaries supported to date compared to the targeted number.
- the actual level of expenditure to date compared to the targeted expenditure.
- the steps that have been taken to improve the quality of the implementation system
- result of each activity

## Annex 2 - Household questionnaire

BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE			
QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER	Enumerator' CODE	DATE	
SETTLEMENT/VILLAGE:	RESPONDER NAME	SEX M/F	AGE
<b>1</b>	<b>Preliminary info</b>		<b>Preliminary info</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Responding on behalf recipient of compensation (name of recipient)?</b>		
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Head of household:</b> 1. Male, 2. Female		
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Relationship of respondent to the head of household?</b> 1. Head of household 2. Husband/wife 3. Mother / Father 4. Son / Daughter 5. In law relatives 6. Grand parents / Grand children 7. Other (specify)_____		
<b>1.4</b>	<b>How many people live in your household?</b> 1. Male 2. Female		1. _____ 2. _____
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Number of underage (up to 18 years old) persons in the household?</b> 1. Male 2. Female		1. _____ 2. _____
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Number of pensioners in the household?</b> 1. Male 2. Female		1. _____ 2. _____
<b>2.</b>	<b>Economic data</b>		<b>Economic data</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>What is the main income for the household?</b> 1. Males 2. Females 1. Agriculture – occasional sales of production surpluses. 2. Agriculture – regular sales of production surpluses 3. Agriculture – commercial scale production; 4. Other self-employment/family business activity (trade, craftsmanship, store etc.) 5. Season work for others (picking fruit, fishing, construction works etc.) 6. Salary (regular work) for others 7. Pension 8. Social benefits (state IDP allowance, welfare, disability payments) 9. Income gained from letting/leasing property/land 10. Aid from a friend/relative living in Albania or abroad 11. Other source (specify)_____		1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____ 1. _____ 2. _____
<b>2.2</b>	<b>How many persons from the household are unemployed?</b> 1. Male 2. Female		1. _____ 2. _____
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Are those unemployed seeking employment</b> 1. Yes 2. No, please elaborate why _____		
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Has the social-economic situation of your household changed in the last year?</b> 1. Has worsened (specify why)_____ 2. Hasn't changed (specify why)_____ 3. Has improved (specify why)_____ 4. I don't know		
<b>3</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>		<b>Agriculture</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>How many persons from the HH are involved in Agricultural production?</b> 1. Male 2. Female		1. _____ 2. _____
<b>3.2</b>	<b>What type of production are you engaged in (ha)</b> 1. Combinable crops (alfalfa, maize, wheat, barley, other), 2. Orchards/Vineyards (ha or roots), 3. Vegetable 4. Other (Specify _____)		
<b>3.3</b>	<b>How much land does your household own?</b> (in Ha)		
<b>3.4</b>	<b>How much the land does your household rent?</b> (in Ha)		
<b>3.5</b>	<b>In how many land parcels is the household land divided?</b>		
<b>3.6</b>	<b>How many persons in the household own the land belonging to the household?</b>		
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Who owns the land in the household?</b> 1. Man 2/ Women 3. Co-owned		
<b>3.8</b>	<b>How much land does your household cultivate?</b> (in Ha)		

Impact assessment – Compensation grants component - Albania

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Own</li> <li>2. Rented</li> </ol>		
3.9	<b>What percent of your horticultural production is used for own consumption (including for animal feed)?</b>		
3.10	<b>What type and how many animals does the HH own/keep?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cattle,</li> <li>2. Sheep/goats,</li> <li>3. Poultry,</li> <li>4. Pigs,</li> <li>5. Rabbits,</li> <li>6. Equids</li> <li>7. Beehives</li> <li>8. Other (specify) _____</li> </ol>	<b>Type</b>	<b>No</b>
3.11	<b>What percent of animal products are spent for the household's own consumption?</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Use of compensation payment</b>		
4.1	<b>Have you received the compensation payment?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No, do you know why? _____</li> </ol>		
4.2	<b>Are you satisfied with the compensation payment?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very Much</li> <li>2. Moderately</li> <li>3. No, Why _____</li> </ol>		
4.3	<b>How do you evaluate the value of the compensation payment compared related to the effects on your agricultural production?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enabling recovery of my production to pre disaster level</li> <li>2. Partially ensuring recovery of my production, Please elaborate why _____</li> <li>3. Insufficient to recover my production, Please elaborate why _____</li> </ol>		
4.4	<b>How much of the compensation you have spent by now (%)?</b>		
4.5	<b>In what you have invested compensation received?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agricultural production, Share invested _____ %</li> <li>2. Household improvements (specify) _____ Share invested _____ %</li> <li>3. Other (specify) _____, Share invested _____ %</li> </ol>		
4.6	<b>Who was the decision-maker of the purpose for investment of compensation funds?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Men</li> <li>2. Women</li> <li>3. Jointly</li> </ol>		
4.7	<b>If the compensation was invested into Agriculture, in what you did invest?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To recover previous production</li> <li>2) Invested into new production, Please elaborate _____</li> <li>3) Improvement of the Previous production Please elaborate _____</li> <li>4) Other (specify) _____</li> </ol>		
4.8	<b>To what extent, the compensation covered your losses?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Totally, 100 %</li> <li>2. Partially, (specify) _____ %</li> <li>3. Not at all (specify): _____</li> </ol>		
4.9	<b>How best do you think you can protect yourself against repetition of the floods?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Training and knowledge please elaborate _____</li> <li>2. Investments, please elaborate _____</li> <li>3. I can't, please elaborate _____</li> </ol>		
4.10	<b>Any suggestions on how the Municipality and the Government can improve in management of this and similar disasters?</b>		
4.11	<b>Does the HH need any type of assistance to further develop your agricultural business?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No</li> <li>2. Training/knowledge</li> <li>3. Economic elaboration</li> <li>4. Practical experience</li> <li>5. Investment support</li> <li>6. Other (specify) _____</li> </ol>		

**Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations (FAO)  
FAO Representation in Albania**

Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development  
and Water Administration

Blv. Dëshmoret e Kombit, Nr.2, 1001 Tirana

Telephone/Fax:+355-4-228355

[FAO-AL@fao.org](mailto:FAO-AL@fao.org)