

## ERM PAKTIKA HEAT Assessment Report

PKK-ERM-1704-05

### 1. General Information:

<b>Assessment Location:</b> <i>(Province/District/Village)</i>	Province: Paktika Province District: Center, Mata Khan, Urgoon		
<b>Type of crises:</b> <i>(Conflict/Nat. Disaster/Other)</i>	Undocumented Returnees forcefully returned from Pakistan		
<b>Crisis Location :</b> <i>(Province/District/Village)</i>	Pakistan		
<b>Assessment Team:</b> <i>(Name of I/NGO in the assessment team)</i>	Solidarités International – DoRR, DoRRD, CTG/WFP		
<b>Crises date:</b> <i>(date of displacement-Estimated)</i>	13 <sup>th</sup> April-17		
<b>Date of Notification:</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> April-17		
<b>Date of Assessment:</b> <i>(starting date/ending date)</i>	From 17/04/2017 to 19/04/2017		
<b>Affected Population:</b> <i>(Total Caseload: IDP/CAT A/CAT B/Other)</i>	HHS:	Families:	Inds.:
	23	23	164
<b>Data collection method</b>	Electronic	Hardcopy	
		✓	

### 2. Assessment Findings and Recommendations in brief:

Following a notification received by the DORR, SI ERM team organized a joint Household (HEAT) assessment with DORR, DoRRD, and CTG/WFP. The first notification was issued on April 13<sup>th</sup> and listed 101 households. Following the HEAT assessment of these 101 HHS, 23 were identified as being eligible. Reasons for non-eligibility included return that had occurred more than 6 months ago and duplication in the list.

The majority of interviewed returnees had been living for 20 to 40 years in Pakistan before coming back to Afghanistan between August 2016 and April 2017. As they did not travel through Nangarhar and related transit camps but directly crossed the illegal border instead, only 10 HHS have POR cards. Their registration as undocumented returnees was done on site by Paktika- DoRR and UNHCR.

Overall, the population assessed is characterized by a consistent level of vulnerability. The 68% of the assessed population is less than 18 years old, and females account for 51% of the total population. Households are composed of 7 individuals on average.

**Table 1 - Population composition**

	New born		Children's (1-5)		Adolescents (5-18)		Adults(18-50)		Elder(+50)		Total		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	Total
TOTAL #	7	7	27	27	21	23	23	24	2	3	80	84	164
Total Ratio %	4%	4%	16%	16%	13%	14%	14%	15%	1%	2%	49%	51%	100%

**Recommendations:** Following the HEAT assessment, 23 HHs have been identified as eligible for ERM assistance considering their demographics and assessed living conditions.

Around 43% of them had to sell their assets before their arrival to their current location. In addition, 12 out of the 23 assessed households do not have any food stock (52%) and the average CSI of all returnee families is highly critical (17.8), which highlights their significant food insecurity.

Regarding the WASH situation of these families, all of them have reported having a regular, sufficient and easy access to safe drinking water. In addition, 87% of returnee HHs have access to family latrines.

As for shelter, 43% of the families are accommodated in rented houses while 30.4% are hosted by local population and 26% live in their own houses.

No assessed households reported having received any kind of assistance since they returned.

As a result of these assessment findings, 2 different needs of assistance have been identified for these 23 HHs:

- **Food assistance:** to be provided by SI
- **NFI (including hygiene items) assistance:** to be provided by SI

After the assessment was conducted, a coordination meeting was held with DoRR, CTG/WFP and DoRRD. It was agreed upon by that SI will provide Cash for Food, Cash for NFI and Cash for Hygiene.

### 3. Sectorial Issues:

**A) Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihood:** *(provide detailed information about the impact of food security and livelihood i.e. lost/damaged food stock, current food stock statues, income sources, damaged/destroyed crops and agricultural land, type of agricultural Land, agricultural inputs availability, diet diversity, irrigation system, livestock etc also describe immediate food and nutritional need and provide recommendation about the short and long term food and nutrition assistance)*

The food security situation of assessed families is precarious with 100% of the families having to adopt negative coping mechanisms when facing difficulties in meeting their food needs. 22 out of the 23 assessed HH indeed have a CSI score over 11, which indicates a critical adoption of negative coping strategies related to food. These households are therefore affected by high food insecurity.

In addition, households benefit from no or very low food stock, with 52% of them reporting having no food stock at all, 17% having less than a week-worth of food stock, and 30% having between 1-3 week of food stocks. Food was thus expressed as the second most priority need by 100% of interviewed households.

**Table 2 - HH CSI Score**

CSI	HH #	HH %
Less critical (<7)	0	0%
critical (7<x<11)	0	0%
Most critical (>11)	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Avg. CSI</b>	<b>17.8</b>	

**Table 3 - Food stock length**

Food stock length	HH #	HH %
No stock	<b>12</b>	<b>52.2%</b>
Less than a week	4	17.4%
1 to 3 weeks	7	30.4%
Up to 3 months	0	0%
Over 3 months	0	0%

These vulnerabilities are confirmed by the findings related to their financial situation. First, only 15 of the 23 interviewed HHs brought assets with them, while 10 other had to sell theirs prior to their departure. 83% of the families have a debt higher than 8,000 AFN, and 13% of between 2,000 and 8,000 AFN. Only one household has a debt lower than 2,000 AFN. 83% of interviewed HHs earn income from daily working, while 17% do not have any income at all. On average, the monthly income of these families as thus dropped of 66% since they returned, from 7,174AFN to 2435 AFN a month on average. In addition, 100% of these families do not have access to land, and none of them own any livestock.

**Table 4 - Debt rate among HHs**

Debts	HH #	HH %
No debts	0	0%
Less than 2,000 AFN	1	4%
Between 2,000 and 8,000 AFN	3	13 %
More than 8,000 AFN	19	83%

**Table 5 - Monthly income before/after shock**

Monthly income	Before shock	After shock	% decrease
<b>Average (in AFN)</b>	7,174	2,435	66%

**Recommendations:**

Food assistance is the second main need of these returnee families. The significant level of negative coping strategies adopted, the lack of food stock and the poor financial status indicate a high vulnerability regarding food security. All 23 families should therefore receive Cash for Food assistance (by SI).

**B) NFI:** *(provide detailed information about NFI items lost due to disasters/crises as well as what type of NFI is needed for how many families and when? NFI can include Cooking items, kitchen items, hygiene items, bedding, clothing, fuel etc.)*

Non-Food Items were reported to be the first main priority need for 96% of the families. They reported having a need for all types of NFI: kitchen equipment, fuel, hygiene supplies, warm clothes, blankets and water container.

**Table 6 - NFI Needs**

	Does the family have a need for						
	Kitchen equipment	Fuel	Warm clothes	Blanket	Water container	Hygiene supplies	Others
<b>Yes</b>	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
<b>No</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Recommendations:**

NFI is a verified need that should be covered. Assistance for NFI should be provided in cash to all 23 HHs (by SI).

- C) Shelter:** *(please provide detailed information about the status of shelter condition i.e. type of normal shelters, # of shelters moderately damaged, severely damaged and completely destroyed by crises. How many people live in open space, sheltered with host families, etc. What kind of shelter support/assistance is needed and for how many families). Are there land ownership issues?)*

The assessment showed that 10 returnee households (43%) are living in rented houses, while 7 of them are hosted and 6 live in their own houses.

Accommodation		
House	6	26%
Host	7	30%
Tent	0	0%
Rented house	10	43%
Open area	0	0%
Other	0	0%

Among families renting a house, the average monthly rent or contribution cost is 989 AFN. This amount accounts for 41 % of the average current monthly income of these families. Those being hosted benefit from a free accommodation.

Shelter was not mentioned as an immediate need by assessed families.

**Table 7 - Accommodation status**

**Recommendations:**

No specific shelter assistance is planned for the 23HHs as they are being accommodated in rented houses or by hosts. There is no need for shelter assistance.

- D) WASH:** *(provide detailed information about Water sources, affected water source, sanitation (latrines, used water and solid waste management) and hygiene issues. What is recommended in WASH sector and when?)*

The WASH assessment revealed an unbalanced situation among returnees.

Overall the access to water is sufficient: 100% of HHs reported having enough and clean water for all purposes (drinking, cooking and bathing). Women (100%) are in charge of collecting water. The main water sources of all families are pipe water (74%) and pipe water (13%). No households reported having limited access to these water sources, and the average time required to access this water point is 5 minutes by foot on average (which is in line with SPHERE standards). Therefore, it can be concluded that 87% households have access to stable and close water sources.

In addition, 87% of the families (20 HHs) have access to latrine facilities (family pit), and all of these facilities are reported to provide enough privacy and dignity. The 3 remaining households do not have access to any latrines and resort to open defecation as a result, a practice that may vector diseases, especially water-borne diseases.

**Table 8 - Access to sanitation facilities**

	Latrine availability		Type of latrine				Enough privacy and dignity	
	Yes	No	Open defecation	Community latrine	Family pit latrine	Family VIP latrine	Yes	No
<b>HH #</b>	20	3	3	0	20	0	20	3
<b>HH %</b>	87%	13%	13%	0%	87%	0%	87%	13%

Furthermore, 100% of the families (23 HHs) expressed a need for hygiene supplies. Hygiene thus represents a need that should be addressed.

**Recommendations:**

Hygiene was confirmed as the third main need of returnee families. Cash for hygiene should therefore be provided to the 23 families (by SI).

**E) Protection:** *(provide detailed information about protection issues, protection needs, PSN and EVIs (Female H, elderly HHs, child HH, chronically ill members, disable members) and provide precise recommendation regarding IPAs)*

As presented in the table below, the returnee families are characterized by a high level of vulnerability due to their demographics: 68% are children under 18 and 51% of the entire population is female, including 16 breastfeeding women. In addition, 19 out of the 23 assessed HH are vulnerable-headed households.

	Elderly Headed HH #	Female Headed HH #	Child Headed HH #	HH # with more than 3 children <5	HH # with disabled Pp	if Yes # of disabled Pp	HH # with breastfeeding woman	if yes # of women	HH # with pregnant woman	if Yes # of pregnant women	if Yes # of chronic. ill person	if yes # of chronic. ill person
Yes	1	1	0	0	2	2	16	16	1	1	0	0
No	22	22	23	23	21	21	7	7	22	22	23	23

**Table 9 - Specific vulnerabilities of interviewed HHs**

The assessment showed that several families have specific vulnerabilities that may result in a need for protection:

- 1 women-headed HH
- 1 elderly-headed HH
- 2 person with disabilities
- 16 breastfeeding women
- 1 pregnant woman

**Recommendations:** ERM team is currently identifying all protection stakeholders in the province. As a result, families with specific vulnerabilities will be assessed for protection and referred as soon as this process is finalized.

**F) Health:** *(provide information about health issues, damaged/destroyed health facilities, current/available health facilities, access to health services and recommended assistance in this regards)*

**Child immunization**

According to the assessment findings, 91% children are fully immunized, but they do not have immunization card. No TB cases were reported. No death case was reported.

**G) Market Assessment:** *(provide summary information regarding the local market, accessibility, security constrains and fill the table if an market assessment has been conducted)*

The assessment showed that 100% of returnee families have access to a fully functional market. The average distance to the market is 4.3 km.

The supply of the market is stable and secured. Most of the food items are available in the market.



**H) Other:** *provide detailed information about any other issue that is not covered above, this can include, security, infrastructure, coordination & assistance provided by others, problems encountered during the assessment, etc)*

N/A

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

*(Provide detailed information about top 3 priority needs of affected population as per the opinion of affected population and provide your recommendation how and when identified needs shall be addressed)*

As shown in the table below, the 3 main priority needs expressed by returnee families are:

- 1) NFI
- 2) Food
- 3) Hygiene

**Table 10 - Main priority needs**

Needs	1st priority		2nd priority		3rd priority		Total mentioned	
	HH #	HH %	HH #	HH %	HH #	HH %	#	%
Food	0	0%	23	<b>100%</b>	0	0%	23	<b>33%</b>
Hygiene	1	4%	0	0%	22	<b>96%</b>	23	<b>33%</b>
Latrines	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NFI	22	<b>96%</b>	0	0%	1	4%	23	<b>33%</b>
<b>Total respondent (HH #/%)</b>	23	100%	23	100%	4	100%	69	100%

**Challenges:** N/A

#### Annexes

*(Please provide the database collected under the ERM household assessment in electronic form)*

Assessment database:

[PKK-ERM-1704-05 HEAT database.xlsx](#)

Report written by: Shah Mahmood – ERM- PM, [wdk.erm.pm@solidarites-afghanistan](mailto:wdk.erm.pm@solidarites-afghanistan).

Date of writing: April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017