



ERM Household Assessment Report

1. General Information:

Assessment Location: (Province/District/Village)	Paktya province, Gardez city multiple villages.		
Type of crises: (Conflict/Nat. Disaster/Other)	Conflict		
Crisis Location: (Province/District/Village)	Zurmat, Jaji Aroub, Said Karam, Chamkani, Lija Ahmad Khail, Jani Khail and Ahmad Aba districts of Paktya province, Khost, Logar, Baghlan, Kunduz and Nangahar provinces.		
Assessment Team: (Name of I/NGO in the assessment team)	PIN, DoRR and ANDMA		
Crises date: (date of displacement- Estimated)	April – September 2017		
Date of Notification:	23 August - 2017		
Date of Assessment: (starting date/ending date)	10 – 25 September.2017		
Affected Population: (Total Caseload: IDP/CAT A/CAT B/Other)	HHs:	Families:	Inds:
	84	84	519
Data collection method	Electronic	Hardcopy	
	Yes		

2. Assessment Finding and Recommendation in brief:

On the 23rd August OCHA conducted a HRT meeting with partners and government departments including HN-TPO, IOM, OHD, IRC, MRCA,¹ UNICEF, WHO, OCHA, ANDMA and DoRR. It was agreed that approximately 400 IDPs in Gardez city would be assessed for potential ERM assistance.

Households reported having been displaced due to ongoing armed conflict and military operations in and around insecure districts of Paktya province (Ahmad Aba, Chamkani, Gardez, Jaji Aroub, Jani Khail, Lija Ahmad Khail, Zurmat and Said Karam) as well as from Khost, Kunduz, Baghlan, Nangarhar and Logar. HEAT assessments conducted between 10 – 25th September, confirmed that 88% of households were displaced from insecure districts of Paktya province.

Households that were assessed arrived with no food stocks, household items, and felt unable to return home due to ongoing conflict. Of the 84HHs, 80 of the households reported having accumulated over 8000 AFA in debt. With daily work as the primary source of income, the opportunities for secure livelihoods are potentially limited in the new area of displacement.

¹ **HN-TPO:** Health Net-TPO, **OHD:** Organization for Humanitarian Development, **IRC:** International Rescue Committee, **MRCA:** Medical Refresher Courses for Afghans

The significant delay between the notification and the start of the assessment was a result of a variety of factors including a delay in the preparation of the petition list as well as a delay in the start of the assessment due to a lack of resources from DoRR. Whilst joint assessments are usually conducted with a DoRR representative present, it has been seen to cause delays, an ongoing concern that needs to be addressed by PIN and other ERM partners.

Recommendations:

374 households were assessed with 84 families found eligible to receive the full SMEB package. To note, 25 families were located in insecure areas not accessible to NGOs assessment teams, and 22 families that their phone numbers was off not reachable during assessment days.

3. Sectorial Issues:

A) Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihood:

Households use a variety of coping strategies when faced with challenges meeting their food needs. Some of those strategies reported include adjustments or changes in household food consumption such as eating less preferred or less expensive food, reducing the number of meals, and adults eating less in order to provide sufficient food for the children. Among the various coping strategies practiced by families, 51 percent of the respondents reported that they relied on less preferred or less expensive food, around 83 percent reported that adults especially parents were consuming less food to feed their small children, 80 percent reported the families borrow food from relatives and 72 percent with limit portion size at mealtimes.

IDPs families reported being mostly dependent on unstable sources of income such as daily labor. The majority of families reported that heads of households were mainly unskilled workers or received income through physical labour, in Gardez city, some individuals are only able to get 3 – 4 days of work per week, at minimal wage, meaning increased challenges in supporting their families, as the weather condition particularly in Paktya getting cold soon in comparison to the others provinces, thus daily wage opportunity decreasing.

Close to 95% of the 84HHs reported accumulating new debt of 2000 AFA and above since the displacement, with the majority of households reporting having accumulated over 8000 AFA already since displacement. All households reported their income before and after displacement except 1 household, of the 83HHs who did respond, there was an average loss of 2654 AFA in income. The loss of this income is close to an average monthly income of a household in Afghanistan and can have additional negative affects on the family, from an inability to access basic needs to increasing protection concerns to sustain the household.

Recommendation:

Include cash for food within SMEB package. Market assessments reported functional markets

B) NFI:

Below is the breakdown of reported needs from respondents:

Kitchen	Heating materials	Clothing	Blanket	Water container	Hygiene	Other
83	81	49	79	61	45	0

Recommendation:

Include cash for NFIs as part of SMEB package

C) Shelter:

- 60 HHs reported living in rented accommodation with an average rent of 2978 AFA per month.
- 21 HHs reported living with host communities
- 3 HHs reported living in open areas

Recommendation:

Considering the primary source of income of the majority of families is as daily workers, additional support for shelter should be included within the SMEB

D) WASH:

On average, households reported that the closest water source by foot was 4 minutes away with the majority of households reporting that they accessed water through hand pumps (78HHs).

Whilst 93% of respondents reported using a latrine, there was a small number of respondents reporting open defecation (7% or 6HHs) which could have negative impacts on health and other hygiene practices.

Of the households assessed, 83 households responded that women and children primarily collected water. Demographic data collected also showed approximately 41% of IDP population were female between 6 – 59 years of age (with 16% between 19 – 59), and whilst no data was collected in relation to this; especially in a population where almost half of the population are women are within reproductive age, it can be inferred that there will be a variety of different hygiene needs.

Recommendation:

- Distribute hygiene kits and conduct hygiene promotion.
- Provision of emergency latrines for 6 households

E) Protection:

Below is the breakdown of households who reported additional vulnerabilities

Female headed HH	3
Chronically ill	3
Elderly-headed HH	2
Physical disability	2

Recommendation:

No households met selection criteria to trigger an IPA

F) Health:

Health facilities are available in Gardez city including a hospital and private clinics. The average distance to the nearest health facility is 5km.

G) Education:

The majority of the IDPs families reported that their children were attending school in Gardez city (55% boys (46) and 48% girls (40). Of the households that reported that their children were not in school, 23% reported that language problems were the main hindrance with only 2% reporting a lack of documentation as the problem.

Whilst it is hard to make clear comparisons, anecdotally, boys and girls were provided relatively the same opportunities to attend school. Proportionally, there were less boys in schools (74%) than girls (81%) which could be based on higher figures of households with young boys (62HHs) compared to 54HHs who reported having young females in the family. It could also be inferred that the boys who were not in school, besides language and documentation challenges were sent out to work. This though is inconclusive as only 2 household responded when asked about whether children were sent to work.

H) MARKET ASSESSMENT:

<i>ITEM</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Price AFN /Unit</i>	<i>Change in price? (Yes/No/Increase since the displacement/Decreased)</i>
<i>Wheat Flour, White</i>	<i>Kg</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Rice</i>	<i>Kg</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Oil</i>	<i>Liter</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Diesel</i>	<i>Liter</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>No</i>

h) Other:

4. Urgent Priority needs of affected people (as per affected point of view)

- 51% of households shelter and NFIs as a first priority requesting cash, whilst 37% reported prioritized food
- 39% reported NFIs as a second priority
- 45% reported the same NFIs as the third priority

Response:

- PIN to provide 84 HHs with hygiene kits in kind with support from SI on hygiene promotion
- SI to provide 6 families with emergency latrine and bathing facilities
- Provide Full SMEB package for 84 families across two instalments as per below:

	Instalments	
	First	Second
Food	6000	6000
NFIs	4000	
Shelter (Rent)	2000	2000
Fuel/Electricity	2000	2000
Health	2000	1000

Transportation	1000	
Float	2000	
Total (AFA)	19.000	11.000

Challenges:

No challenges were experienced during assessment.

5. Annexes



Report written by: Sibghatullah Himat/ERM Team leader, East
Date of writing: 01/10/2017