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About the PMTF

The Protection Monitoring Task Force (PMTF), an initiative of the Syria Protection Cluster (Turkey), is composed of Syrian NGOs and international NGOs and aims to develop the capacity of humanitarian actors to assess, analyze, and respond to protection needs in Syria.

Roughly twenty non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and clusters were involved in the formation of the PMTF, which is co-led by the Office of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Rescue Committee (IRC). As of the time of this reporting, twelve members actively contribute to monthly protection monitoring, which began in March 2017.

All quarterly reports are available on the Syria Protection Cluster (Turkey) page of the Humanitarian Response Website, where readers can also consult the 2018 Protection Monitoring Interactive Dashboard, which allows for more detailed information by indicator, location, and month.

Using lessons learned from monthly monitoring in 2017, the active members of the PMTF undertook the revision of the monthly community-level key-informant interview with the goal of streamlining data collection in 2018. This is the third quarterly report to reflect data collected with those tools.

Acronyms

AOG          Armed Opposition Group
CAAFAG       Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups
FGD          Focus Group Discussion
GoS          Government of Syria
GoT          Government of Turkey
HLP          Housing, Land, and Property
HNO          Humanitarian Needs Overview
IDP          Internally Displaced Persons
INGO         International Non-Governmental Organization
KI           Key Informant
KII          Key Informant Interview
NGO          Non-Governmental Organization
PMTF         Protection Monitoring Task Force
PNO          Protection Needs Overview
UASC         Unaccompanied and Separated Children
UNMAS        United Nations Mine Action Service
WASH         Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene

1 https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/stima/protection
2 http://tiny.cc/jwnory
Contents

About the PMTF ................................................................. 2
Acronyms ........................................................................ 2
Recommendations for Humanitarian Actors ......................... 4
Situational Overview ............................................................ 7
Data Collection Methodology and Data Presentation .............. 8
Monitoring Location and KI Profile ...................................... 9
Findings ........................................................................... 14
  2.1 Rights ........................................................................ 14
    2.1.1 Civil Status Documentation (CSD) .......................... 14
    2.1.2 Access to Justice .................................................. 18
    2.1.3 Social Cohesion .................................................... 19
  2.2 Basic Services ............................................................. 24
    2.2.1 Access to Education .............................................. 25
    2.2.2 Access to Health .................................................. 31
    2.2.3 Specialized Services .............................................. 36
    2.2.4 Access to Water .................................................. 38
    2.2.5 Humanitarian Assistance ......................................... 42
    2.2.6 Access to Markets ................................................. 45
    2.2.7 Access to Electricity ............................................. 48
    2.2.8 Access to Housing and Shelter ................................ 50
    2.2.9 Access to Employment .......................................... 54
  2.3 Vulnerability .................................................................. 58
    2.3.1 Risks for Children ................................................. 58
    2.3.2 Impact of Conflict on Children’s Psychological Wellbeing ........................................ 62
    2.3.3 Child Separation ................................................... 63
    2.3.4 Child Labor .......................................................... 64
    2.3.5 Violence and Exploitation in Child Labor .................. 66
    2.3.6 Services for Persons with Special Needs and Older Persons .................................. 67
  2.4 Demographic Groups and Movements .............................. 68
    2.4.1 Freedom of Movement / Movement Restrictions .................. 68
    2.4.2 IDP Movement .................................................... 71
  2.5 Explosive Hazards, Security Incidents, and Community Structures ....... 78
    2.5.1 Explosive Hazards ................................................. 78
    2.5.2 Security Incidents ................................................. 80
    2.5.3 Community Structures .......................................... 81
  2.6 Coping Mechanisms ...................................................... 85
Conclusion ......................................................................... 88
Online Interactive Dashboard ............................................. 89
Recommendations for Humanitarian Actors

In consideration of the findings from April to June 2018, the Protection Monitoring Task Force makes the following recommendations to the humanitarian community. In implementing these recommendations, humanitarian actors are reminded to ensure and prioritize the security and safety of their staff and the communities they serve in every activity, and to formulate flexible and integrated programming and response. The Protection Monitoring Task Force recognizes that the unpredictability and volatility of the security situation, as well as other contextual factors, necessitate brave, creative, and innovative problem solving.

➢ **Develop information-sharing processes to ensure that procedures for assistance provision are clear to beneficiaries.** Improve communication with communities about aid distribution by identifying and resolving gaps in information sharing and access. Increase transparency in regards to beneficiary selection criteria among communities, to the extent that it is possible, reasonable, and safe. If sharing criteria is not feasible, conduct community-level consultations on perceived vulnerabilities in an effort to build consensus around the criteria. Additionally, review and update beneficiary lists periodically in order to ensure that assistance is received by those who are most in need, and allow for flexibility for urgent protection cases. Raise awareness of existing feedback and complaint mechanisms.

➢ **Ensure that lack of official civil status documentation does not become a barrier to accessing basic services and humanitarian assistance.** Lack of civil status documentation (CSD) is a widespread phenomenon among communities and should not represent an impediment to receiving humanitarian assistance. Map and improve awareness among humanitarian actors about the impact of missing documentation and alternative mechanisms for identification. Proactively identify and reach out to high-risk demographic groups, such as newly displaced IDPs arriving from besieged and hard-to-reach areas, for CSD-related assistance and counseling. Donors should take the prevalence of lack of documentation into account in terms of their reporting requirements and monitoring mechanisms. Organizations are recommended to avoid requiring multiple types of civil status documentation in order to receive assistance, and to explore other community-validation approaches when possible.

➢ **Support communities in building proper, safe and gender-sensitive WASH facilities.** Improve access to clean and affordable water. In communities where most housing lacks toilet facilities and sewage networks, support the construction of gender segregated WASH facilities. In addition, improve awareness on the prevention of contagious diseases, including about methods for keeping sources of drinking water separate from contaminated water. Direct medical mobile teams to communities experiencing outbreak of diseases due to lack of, or improper, WASH facilities. See section 3.2, Shelter Conditions, for additional information. Improve access to clean, affordable water in underserved and remote locations. Improve community awareness on water purification methods. NGOs providing water to communities are encouraged to ensure that the water is both sufficient in quantity and clean and unpolluted.

➢ **Improve access to low-cost, quality health services.** Increase availability and access to health facilities and health services in affected communities, paying particular attention to cost of transportation and cost of secondary and tertiary health services. Humanitarian organizations can improve women and girls’ access to NGO clinics and mobile teams by employing, training and including female staff in their response teams. Organizations are encouraged to regularly share information about existing health services with community members, especially with newly arrived IDPs and communities and camps that are located far away from city centers. Organizations are encouraged to continue utilizing medical mobile teams to access remote areas. Organizations running medical facilities, and particularly in communities serviced by a single medical facility, must ensure availability and access to emergency medical services 24-hours-per day. Donors are encouraged to respond to gaps in the availability of diagnostic medical equipment in medical facilities.
- **Support livelihood generation.** While continuing to ensure that emergency and basic needs of communities are met, humanitarian organizations are encouraged to support more sustainable interventions that will reduce dependency on humanitarian assistance and poverty.

- **Continue psycho-social support (PSS) and child-friendly activities prioritizing remote, harder-to-reach communities that have never had access to these services.** Findings indicate that PSS and child-friendly activities may be allowing conflict-affected children to recover more quickly from the traumatic effects of war. Children in communities who have not had access to services demonstrate slower recovery. Humanitarian actors can mitigate this by prioritizing and reaching never served communities through mobile PSS services. Further, the humanitarian community is encouraged to brainstorm ways to access and serve the most affected and vulnerable children who cannot be accessed through the traditional mediums of schools, child-friendly-spaces and community centers, such as children engaging in child labor and who are experiencing early marriage.

- **Improve understanding of local structures and preferred means of dispute resolution in communities.** Due to different and varying approaches to dispute resolution in Syrian communities, ensure that humanitarian assistance provision in communities is designed with a comprehensive understanding of local dynamics, and the possible implications for humanitarian actors. In communities where NGOs coordinate humanitarian activities with local councils, advocate for equal gender representation and equal access to programming to sensitize local community structures to issues affecting women and girls in the community.

- **Develop targeted programming for women at risk.** Initiate awareness-raising and income-generation activities for women at risk, such as widows, divorcees and single women. This will foster greater socio-economic support for their survival and autonomy and may also encourage family unity with their children and reduce family separation.

- **Encourage positive social interaction by making programming inclusive of both IDPs, IDP returnees, and host communities.** This is particularly important where IDPs reside in camps physically far from host communities. Where feasible, provide transportation support for residents of isolated camps and communities to access basic services (particularly markets) in towns and city centers. Focus social interaction initiatives on women (IDPs and host community members) who have fewer opportunities to interact due to restrictions in women’s movement. In cases where NGOs represent an important source of employment in the community, ensure that equal employment opportunities are offered to host community members and IDPs and mitigate perceptions of discrimination or inequality.

- **Mitigate factors that prevent school attendance.** Employ a multi-tiered approach that not only reduces financial, physical and security-related barriers to accessing schools, but also influences community perceptions about education through awareness-raising initiatives in light of high prevalence of children dropping out of school in order to work.

- **Mitigate threat of explosive hazards.** Continue and expand risk education and increase awareness on remaining safe from mines and explosive hazards in areas where these risks are most commonly found.

- **Improve access to specialized services.** There is a significant need to scale up and expand dedicated and specialized services. Disabilities that result in lack of or reduction in mobility may result in additional challenges in accessing food, water, non-food items, and other vital humanitarian assistance. In the initial stages, organizations can target community members who are experiencing multiple forms of vulnerability, such as disabled children. For detailed findings and recommendations on specialized services for vulnerable and at risk children, please refer to reports and recommendations of the Child Protection Monitoring Task Force (CPMTF). In communities where specialized services already exist, there is a need for other humanitarian organizations to maintain updated service mapping and increase referrals to the organizations that provide these specialized services.
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Situational Overview, Methodology, Location and Key Informant Profile
Situational Overview

The Syrian conflict, now in its eighth year, has caused continued and staggering suffering of civilians. In the context of armed conflict, besiegement, displacement, increasing poverty and reliance on harmful coping mechanisms, civilians face numerous and overlapping protection risks. Despite the challenging security environment and access constraints, humanitarian actors continue to respond to the humanitarian needs occurring on an overwhelming scale in Syria.

During this reporting period, April–June 2018, the following key developments took place in the context of the Syrian conflict and related displacements:

- In April, while there was a significant reduction in inter-armed group clashes in Idlib governorate due to the ceasefire between the Syrian Liberation Front (SLF) and Hayat Tahrir al-Sham (HTS), sporadic security incidents continued in the governorate, also affecting humanitarian organizations and their staff.

- In May, the Government of Turkey (GoT) continued the construction of observation posts for the monitoring of the de-escalation zone in Idlib, establishing a total of 12 observation posts within May. The Government of Syria (GoS) carried out an offensive into south-eastern Idlib.

- In June, military activity escalated in Southern Syria, and the GoS took control of opposition-held Dara’a and surrounding areas, leaving areas of Northwest Syria as one of the last areas outside government control. These developments resulted in concerns among IDP and host communities in the Northwest, particularly the heavily populated Idlib governorate about the possibility of a GoS military offensive. The humanitarian community has updated existing preparedness plans for potential large-scale displacement in the event of increased conflict activity in Northwest Syria.

As a result of these political and security-related developments, the following displacements were tracked for assessed communities in North and Northwest Syria. These charts and tables are a compilation of data published by the CCCM. Please refer to the bi-weekly reports of CCCM IDP Situation Monitoring Initiative (ISMI) for additional information on these findings.

![Total Arrivals and Departures in Assessed Communities for April, May, June 2018](chart.png)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH 2018</th>
<th>ARRIVALS</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Possible Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>ARRIVALS</td>
<td>Idleb, Aleppo</td>
<td>Displacements from Eastern Ghouta, local agreement in Duma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPARTURES</td>
<td>Idleb, Aleppo, Rural Damascus, Hama</td>
<td>Ceasefire between AOGs, some IDPs desiring to travel from Aleppo to Afrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>ARRIVALS</td>
<td>Idleb &amp; Aleppo</td>
<td>Evacuation agreements in southern rural Damascus and northern Homs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPARTURES</td>
<td>Idleb, Aleppo, Homs, Hama</td>
<td>Some IDPs desiring to travel from Aleppo to Afrin district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>ARRIVALS</td>
<td>Idleb, Aleppo</td>
<td>Aerial bombardments in central Idleb governorate, AOG attacks in Foah and Kefrayya, aerial bombardment in western Aleppo governorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEPARTURES</td>
<td>Homs, Aleppo</td>
<td>Clashes between AOGs in Al Bab and other parts of northern Aleppo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Compilation from CCCM Bi-Weekly Displacement Summary April-June 2018)

These figures and contextual information apply to communities assessed by the CCCM, which closely overlap with communities assessed through protection monitoring during this period. As ISMI assesses total arrivals to and departures from communities across a bi-weekly period, some figures may be repeated displacements.

### Data Collection Methodology and Data Presentation

PMTF members conducted key informant interviews on a monthly basis. The interview questions measure protection risks in the areas of rights, basic needs, vulnerability, demographics, and incidents. The protection indicators were decided in consultation with protection actors and other cluster coordinators.

In order to achieve statistically significant results, members were encouraged to conduct at least three interviews per community per month. Locations were selected depending on factors such as member presence and accessibility.

Through key informants (KI) interviews, members collect quantitative data and qualitative information from KIs – who are active and aware members of the community who are able to assess various protection risks and concerns of all demographic groups.

The majority of the data available in this report is from Idleb governorate (61%). While governorate-level comparisons have been made in this report, readers are encouraged to take into consideration that data from remaining governorates is limited: Aleppo (14%), Hama (11%), Homs (7%), Al-Hasakeh (4%) and Ar-Raqqa (1%). Due to the variety of data collectors and agencies participating in this protection monitoring exercise, the type of responses can vary. In addition, conclusions of data from the governorates cannot be generalized to represent the Syrian population as a whole. The results reported can only be considered the opinions and perceptions of the survey participants. Comparisons between findings in this and earlier reports should also take into account the difference in locations of interviews between the two periods, due to changes in access.

3 [https://app.box.com/s/infq0sr1s21b3rhx13bwj6r7y7x3tfin8](https://app.box.com/s/infq0sr1s21b3rhx13bwj6r7y7x3tfin8)
Maps from the Online Interactive Dashboard which indicate severity of protection risks based on location for the monitoring period are found throughout this report.

The protection monitoring index is a value between 0 and 1. High value of index represents more severity and protection issues (yellow-orange-red colors), and low value of index represents less severity and protection issues (green color).

It is noted that the color severity index may not be representative of an entire sub-district in cases where few number of communities within a sub-district are monitored. It is encouraged to utilize the maps and analysis directly through the Online Interactive Dashboard in order to access all of this information, including the number of interviews conducted in a particular community during the monitoring period. Please refer to the last section of this report for additional information on how to access and use the PMTF Online Interactive Dashboard.

**Monitoring Location and KI Profile**
This report is based on data from 1,186 community-level key-informant (KI) interviews conducted by nine PMTF members between April and June 2018 in six governorates in northern Syria: Idleb, Aleppo, Hama, Homs, Al-Hasakeh and Ar-Raqqa. Monitoring was conducted in the following sub-districts: Al Bab, A’zaz, Jebel Saman, Daret Azza, and Atareb in Aleppo governorate; Dana, Qourqueena, Maaret Tamsrin, Teftnaz, Bennsh, Sarmin, Idleb, Armanaz, Janudiyeh, Jisr-Ash-Shugur, Mhambal, Ariha, Saraqab, Maarat An Numan, Kafr Nobol, Ehsem, Heish, Khan Shaykun sub-districts in Idleb governorate; Ziyara and Madiq Castle sub-districts in As-Suqaylabiyah; Kafr Zeita, As-Salamiyeh, Saboura, Eastern Bari sub-districts in Hama governorate; Ar-Rastan, Talbiseh, Taldu and Homs sub-districts in Homs governorate; Tell Abiad and Ein Issa sub-districts in Ar-Raqqa governorate; Amuda, Quamishli, Qahtaniyyeh, and Jawadiyah sub-districts in Al-Hasakeh governorate.
In this monitoring period, of a total of 1,186 KIs, 27% were female and 73% were male. Teachers were the most common KI asked, followed by local authority, NGO staff, religious leader, medical staff, camp manager, and others. Among “other” KIs are notable members of the community (community leaders and respected individuals), civil activists, engineers, students, traders, police officers, and media staff.

20% (236) of the interviews conducted during this monitoring period resulted in a protection referral to the following sectors.

Types of Assistance Referred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>% of 236 Referrals Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for PWSN</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Support</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aid</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Findings
Findings

2.1 Rights

The results of protection monitoring on rights-related risks reveal the persistence of impediments to civilians’ enjoyment of their rights, and stable and secure lives within their communities. For example, lack of civil documentation places community members at risk of not being able to access basic rights and services. Civilians also experience challenges in maintaining access to shelter and achieving dispute resolution. However, factors such as high social cohesion can mitigate these risks. Humanitarian actors should focus on maintaining and reinforcing positive social interaction between IDPs and the host community, while reducing barriers and disenfranchisement caused by lack of identity documents, unreliable shelter arrangements, and limited interaction with NGOs.

2.1.1 Civil Status Documentation (CSD)

Only a mere 6% of KIs stated that community members are not lacking government-issued civil status documentation, and 93% indicated that either some, most or all community members are lacking government-issued documentation.
The chart below demonstrates the high prevalence of this issue for monitored areas, and how important it is for both humanitarian actors and donors to take this factor into consideration in relation to their humanitarian assistance procedures and civil status documentation requirements for identity verification.

KIs stating that some, most, or all community members lack government-issued civil status documentation most commonly identified the following reasons: GoS services are unavailable in the areas; documents were lost, never obtained, or left behind when fleeing; documents expired and couldn’t be renewed due to concerns about approaching authorities; and not being able to afford the cost.
Why Do People in the Community Lacking Government-Issued Civil Documents Not Have Them?

- GoS Services Not Available: Female 43%, Male 50%
- Lost: Female 49%, Male 56%
- Never Had It: Female 36%, Male 24%
- Left Behind When Fleeing: Female 28%, Male 33%
- Expired Document: Female 32%, Male 21%
- Concerns Approaching Authority: Female 29%, Male 19%
- Could Not Afford It: Female 20%, Male 17%
- Counseling/Legal Services Not Available: Female 13%, Male 8%
- Confiscated: Female 11%, Male 5%
- Didn't Attempt to Obtain: Female 9%, Male 7%
- Another Family Member Has Possession of It: Female 8%, Male 5%
- Do Not Know: Female 4%, Male 3%
- Other: Female 0%, Male 0%

Do Community Members Encounter Risks as a Result of Lacking GoS-Issued Documentation or Using Non-GoS Documentation?

- Cannot Move Through Certain Areas: Female 50%, Male 45%
- No Impact: Female 34%, Male 32%
- Difficulty Finding Employment: Female 19%, Male 28%
- Cannot Access Humanitarian Assistance: Female 12%, Male 21%
- Cannot Access Schools: Female 13%, Male 14%
- Cannot Access Medical Services: Female 4%, Male 10%
- Other: Female 2%, Male 4%
While 32% of KIs indicated that the lack of government-issued documentation or use of non-GoS documentation has no impact at all on the community, other KIs identified various risks. The most commonly mentioned risk was the inability to move through certain areas. Additionally, KIs state that community members experience challenges in accessing humanitarian assistance, schools, employment and medical services.

KIs continue to indicate that documentation is a requirement to access humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian organizations often request CSD as proof of identity before distributing assistance. One KI in Harim district of Idleb governorate explains that some humanitarian organizations are now requesting more than one form of documentation to register IDPs, due to increasing instances of fraud. Humanitarian assistance is distributed based on need and organizations implement specific and well-defined rules and procedures for determining beneficiaries of this aid. Due to mass IDP displacement and increasing need and competition for assistance, some community members or beneficiaries may seek fraudulent ways to obtain or exploit assistance. While humanitarian organizations must take action to prevent fraud and ensure the purposeful and transparent use of their assistance, they should take care that this action does not create additional barriers for those in need to access assistance for their survival. Humanitarian actors are encouraged to utilize alternative approaches of identity verification.

For example, one partner implemented an approach of community validation to ensure the inclusion of community members while mitigating fiduciary risks such as corruption, diversion, or fraud. Community validation allows humanitarian staff to verify that the intended recipient of assistance is the actual recipient of the assistance in the absence of photo identification or when there is no identification. This approach triangulates personal information of the household through local council verification, witnesses (neighbors), and consistency between personal information provided by the household with documented information. This approach not only prevents the exclusion of in-need and vulnerable community members from life-saving assistance, but also helps mitigate the risks of corruption and fraud.

Lacking CSD can be a barrier to education as it is a legal requirement to have the child registered. This can restrict children’s access to GoS-administered schools in the absence of GoS-issued documentation. Additionally, children sometimes cannot continue or complete their education due to lack of official documentation (i.e. transcript) which proves the last level of education completed by the child. However, it is also understood that in addition to the modalities set up with the GoS, there are efforts often also by headmasters of individual schools, to practice flexibility in registration requirements and ensure children with official GoS documentation to access education. Please refer to the “Guidance Note on Documents Requested for School Enrollment and National Exams in the Syrian Arab Republic” produced by UNHCR and NRC for additional information and guidance (May 2018).

In the absence of official CSD, community members rely on alternatives and negative coping mechanisms. One KI noted that alternatives are available and community members can usually obtain alternative documentation by the local council or other local authority. Responses also indicate that alternatives are not equally available and accessible by different groups. The risks and barriers caused by lack of official documentation push some community members’ to resort to the use of forged documents.

In addition, certain demographics of IDPs may be affected by lack of documentation more than others. Young children born after 2011 are particularly affected by the lack of official CSD. Additionally, IDPs arriving from previously besieged or hard-to-reach areas may experience lack of CSD more than those arriving from other areas. For example, one KI noted that many IDP children displaced from Al-Ghouta do not have any identity document cards and birth certificates. The PMTF recommends that protection actors providing CSD-related services identify high-risk demographic groups in the community (such as the one mentioned above) and proactively reach out to these community members for CSD related assistance and counseling.

One additional risk mentioned by KIs in regards to lack of GoS-issued documentation is the inability to travel to GoS-areas, specifically for medical services. Several KIs consistently state that receiving treatment for more serious and complicated medical conditions requires traveling to Damascus, which community members cannot do because they lack official documentation. This indicates that there is a gap in health services in non-GoS areas, which requires attention and response form the humanitarian community. It also indicates that if they had the proper documents, some community members in need of advanced medical treatment would be willing to travel to GoS areas for treatment. Some KIs also emphasize that official documents are needed by employers for the hiring process.
2.1.2 Access to Justice

During the April-June 2018 reporting period, of the 1,186 KIs, 52% stated that when there is a problem or dispute in the community, people resort to informal dispute resolution mechanisms, i.e. resolve themselves. 33% stated that people approach local authorities, 30% stated police, 27% stated sharia courts, 23% stated family leaders, 20% stated religious leaders, 17% stated courts, 8% stated tribal leaders, 5% stated “other,” and 1% stated NGOs. Male KIs were more likely to state that the community resolves problems themselves or appeals to local authorities, while female KIs were more likely to say that the community appeals to Sharia Courts, police or law courts, as seen in the below chart.
While all communities rely on more than one type of mechanism for the resolution of their disputes, the type of preferred entity varies by location. For example, in Al-Malikeyeh and Quamishli districts of Al-Hasakeh, KIs identified local authorities as the primary entity for dispute resolution. In A’zaz district of Aleppo and Homs district of Homs, KIs identified the police as a primary entity for dispute resolution in the community.

It is also noted that during this monitoring period respondents indicated that Sharia courts are called on to resolve disputes more often in districts of Idleb governorate than other districts.

Of 60 KIs who mentioned an “other” entity, 50% mentioned notables, 10% security committee, and 5% Shura council.

### 2.1.3 Social Cohesion
Consistent with data of previous reporting periods, the relationship between IDPs and host community continues to be predominantly a positive one.

Both male and female KIs predominantly stated that the relationship between IDPs and host community is positive. Among KIs who stated that the relationship is limited, negative or nonexistent, female KIs were more likely to choose these options than male KIs. Female KIs located in off-camp locations were more likely to state that the relationship is positive in comparison to female KIs located in in-camp locations. Both male and female KIs mentioned similar reasons for the nature of this relationship. One of the possible reasons for female KIs being more likely to state that the interaction is limited or non-existent may be due to cultural and social restrictions faced by women in the community. For example, restricted movement for women and girls within the community would also present a barrier for interaction between female IDPs and female host community members. Additionally, in-camp residence, as well as the physical distances between camps and host community residences and the inability to afford transportation or the unavailability of transportation, are additional factors that affect these interactions.
KIs in in-camp locations were more likely to state that the interaction is limited, negative or non-existing in comparison to off-camp locations. The reasons for these level of interactions are elaborated below.

The top reasons cited for the positive interaction between IDPs and the host community in this monitoring period is consistent with the findings of earlier quarterly reports. The reason identified the most by KIs was the solidarity felt by the host community toward IDPs. This was followed by the presence of IDPs’ friends and relatives in the area and IDPs’ length of stay in the area.
Job competition and increased cost of living has a greater level of influence on the interaction between IDPs and host community in in-camp locations than in off-camp locations.

Some KI in Al Bab, A’zaz and Jebel Saman districts of Aleppo governorate, Quamishli district of Al Hasakeh governorate, Ar-Rastan district of Homs governorate and Harim and Idleb districts of Idleb governorate noted limited or negative interaction. These locations host large numbers of IDPs and also regularly experience both arrivals and departures of IDPs, thus possibly contributing to disruption of community networks and community trust. Consistent with this, factors which have a negative impact on the relationship between IDPs and host community are mentioned more frequently in these areas.
In this monitoring period, KIs continued to emphasize that certain factors contribute to greater solidarity and positive relations. For example, IDPs’ length of stay has a positive correlation. In most cases, longer duration of stay results in better relations between host community and IDPs. Commonalities between the IDP and host groups also contributes to positive relations. These commonalities include familial and blood ties, newly formed ties through marriage within the community, common values, and the personal histories of the host community. Host communities which have previously experienced displacement due to conflict are more likely to experience solidarity with IDPs.

On the other hand, economic factors, particularly access to employment and resources continue to strain relations in many communities resulting in limited and sometimes negative relations. It is also noted however that limited relations are also often caused by the distance between IDP camps and city centers where host communities live, and therefore is not always indicative of strained relationship between these groups, but rather an indication of lack of opportunities to interact with each other.

According to one KI in As-Salamiyeh, Hama, the negative interaction that was earlier reported there between IDPs and host community has recently decreased due to the departure of many of those IDP families from the community. The tension between the community members lasted for many months because the host community perceived the IDPs to be affiliated with ISIS.

The perceived relationship between IDPs and host community presented the following trend in Atma community of Idleb governorate, which has hosted high numbers of IDPs since the beginning of the crisis. The percentage of KIs stating that there is no interaction or a negative interaction shows a reduction, while KIs stating that the interaction is positive is increasing.
2.2 Basic Services

Monitoring shows that community members continue to experience challenges in accessing basic commodities and services, including food, education, healthcare and employment, due to damage to education, health, and WASH infrastructure, as well as other reasons, including limitations on freedom of movement and security concerns, including fear of generalized violence and criminal activity.

The monthly community-level KI interviews ask community members about damage to education, health and WASH infrastructure in their communities that occurred during the three weeks preceding the interview. Damaged or destroyed infrastructure limits and prevents community members’ access to basic services. This information is not representative of all affected/damaged infrastructure in Syria, does not attribute the act to any party to the conflict and does not identify the communities affected by this damage.
2.2.1 Access to Education

Basic Needs - Indicator 2.1
Prevalence of Boys and Girls Not Attending School

Are Boys and Girls Attending School in this Community?

% of 1186 Kids Identifying Each Option for Boys and Girls in the Community

- None: Boys 3%, Girls 3%
- Some: Boys 10%, Girls 11%
- Most: Boys 29%, Girls 29%
- All: Boys 58%, Girls 57%
There are no significant differences in access to education between boys and girls in this monitoring data. As described below, however, there are some differences in perceived barriers to access for boys and girls.

All KIs in Al Bab district of Aleppo governorate and Muhradah district of Hama governorate, stated that neither boys nor girls have access to education in their communities. Additionally, the majority of KIs in Homs district of Homs governorate stated that only some boys and girls have access to education.
The findings on boys and girls school attendance in Muhradah district of Hama governorate is consistent with the previous (January-March) reporting period.

In Al Bab district of Aleppo governorate, during the January-March reporting period, around 50% of KIs had stated that most boys and girls in the community were attending school, while the remaining 50% had stated that no boys and girls are attending school. In this reporting period, all KIs from Al Bab state that no boys and girls are attending school. According to information provided, the change in school attendance in Al Bab is reportedly caused by the increased rate of children dropping out of school in order to work and support their family.

The primary reason for both boys’ and girls’ inability to attend school in monitored communities is the need for children to support their families. Boys leave school to support the family by working while girls leave school in order to help the family at home. In addition, the cost of school materials and transportation to school continue to be barriers to accessing education. Security concerns in communities also continue to impact school attendance. Other issues including overcrowding, discrimination or mistreatment at schools are additional factors.
In areas where clashes between armed groups and changes in control lines continue, security is the primary obstacle. This is especially noted for As-Suqaylabiya and Muhradah districts of Hama governorate, and Al Ma’ra, Ariha and Jisr-Ash-Shugur districts of Idleb governorate. Communities of Idleb governorate experienced increased security incidents, often involving improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices (VBIEDs), during this period.

KIs mentioned overcrowding in schools as a barrier to accessing education in the following districts: Jebel Saman of Aleppo, Quamishli of Al-Hasakeh, and Harim and Idleb districts of Idleb governorate. Many of these locations experience high prevalence of IDPs and sometimes damage to school infrastructure due to conflict activity, which contributes to overcrowding and insufficient facilities for education.
The inability to afford transportation to school and the cost of school materials continues to affect boys and girls in many of the monitored communities. Humanitarian organizations can mitigate the inability of families to afford transportation, the cost of school materials, overcrowded schools and mistreatment or discrimination at schools.

Livelihood programs for parents and awareness raising campaigns on the importance of education for girls can help mitigate child labor and early marriage.

“Other” reasons cited by KIs for barriers to boys’ access to education included the absence of a school in the community (most often mentioned in relation to villages) and the destruction of the school by conflict activity and shelling (mentioned for Al Ma’ra district of Idlib governorate). For girls, “other” reasons included these, as well as dropout due to early marriage and the opinion among some families that girls do not need to be educated.

“Some families consider girls’ education to be unnecessary, because in the end, she will get married. (Male KII, Off-Camp, Religious Leader, As-Salamiyeh district, Hama governorate).”
KIs mentioned damage to some education infrastructure by conflict activity in Jebel Saman district of Aleppo, As-Suqaylabiyah district of Hama, Ar-Rastan district of Homs, and Al Ma’ra, Harim and Idleb districts of Idleb governorate. The findings correlate with escalation of conflict activity such as shelling and airstrikes and security incidents during this period.
2.2.2 Access to Health

Basic Needs - Indicator 2.2
Prevalence of Challenges in Accessing Health Services

Is It a Challenge for Members of the Community to Access Health Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female Kl</th>
<th>Male Kl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Male KIs were more likely to state that some, most, or all of the community experiences challenges in accessing health services.

Findings indicate that communities monitored in A’zaz district of Aleppo governorate and Harim district of Idlib governorate reportedly experience the fewest challenges in accessing health services. For other districts monitored, KIs indicated that some or most of the community is experiencing challenges. More than half of the KIs in Ar-Rastan district of Homs and close to half of the KIs in Ariha district that stated that all of the community is experiencing challenges in accessing health services. Access is also problematic in Homs district and in Al Ma’ra, Idlib and Jisr-Ash-Shugur districts of Idlib governorate. The specific reasons for these challenges will be described below.

What Barriers Does the Community Face When Accessing Health Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Services in Area</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Costs</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Unavailable</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Quality Services in Area</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Health Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Privacy for Women</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know Services in Area</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humanitarian actors are recommended to share information about available health services with community members, especially newly arrived IDPs to the community, or communities and camps that are located far from the city centers where medical facilities may be located. In addition, organizations are encouraged to continue utilizing medical mobile teams to reach remote areas in order to serve community members who cannot travel to medical facilities.

Lack of services in the area, transport costs, unavailability of medicine, poor quality health services in the area and the cost of health services are the main barriers that community members face in accessing health services.

Among “other” barriers to accessing health services, KIs in Muhradah district of Hama stated that the hospitals in their area experienced continuous bombardments during this period, causing them to go out of service. KIs in As-Suqaylabiyah district of Hama stated that medical facilities lack specialized services and essential diagnostic equipment such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Three KIs in Al Ma’ra district also indicated that the health center in their area was bombed and taken out of service, preventing their access to health care. In Ar-Rastan district of Homs governorate, one KI indicated that the lines of control in their community shifted to GoS-control which resulted in the displacement of medical staff who operated the medical facilities in the area, and the resultant closure of these facilities. In Quamishli district of Al-Hasakah governorate, two KIs stated that the fear of arrest and the fear of forced recruitment are barriers to accessing health services.

One KI in As-Suqaylabiyah district and one KI in Idlib district emphasized the lack of emergency services, stating that existing health facilities only operate during the day, and the absence of an emergency room prevents community members from accessing treatment for emergency cases that occur outside of working hours. They note that this has an impact on children in particular. If not already being implemented, humanitarian actors that currently operate
health care facilities in these communities are encouraged to implement rotating night shifts with their medical staff at these facilities, or establish rotating on-call duty of medical staff 24-hours a day to ensure that emergency cases that occur outside of regular hours receive response. This is especially important in communities which have access to only one health care center without alternatives. Health facilities must also ensure that community members have access to contact information of the medical center or on-duty medical staff in the case of emergencies. Donors are encouraged to increase capacity of medical facilities in order to meet these needs.

Distance is one of the primary factors influencing which health care facility community members access for health services. KI responses indicate that community members prefer to receive health care from nearby facilities and resort to traveling to other areas for medical treatment only if the health services in the area are not specialized or advanced enough to provide needed treatment. The absence of nearby health facilities is a significant barrier to access, particularly for villages. For example, villages in Al Ma’ra district of Idleb have to travel around 15 kilometers (9 miles) to access medical services.
3 KIs in Heish sub-district of Al Ma’ra district of Idleb governorate and 1 KI in Ar-Rastan sub-district of Ar-Rastan district of Homs governorate stated that all of health infrastructure in their community had been damaged by conflict activity.

More than half of KIs stated that pregnant women are not able to access prenatal care in their communities. The below chart visualizes the severity of lack of access to prenatal care in monitored locations. In all monitored communities, an alarming percentage of KIs stated that either none or some of women in the community have no access to prenatal care. While specific data on causes is not available, this is mostly likely caused by factors that restrict pregnant women’s access to health care due to factors such as distance to nearest facility, security, social stigma.
(especially experienced by widows or divorced women), fear of violence and harassment, or the lack of facilities offering specialized health care services as described above. Humanitarian actors are encouraged to improve pregnant women’s access to prenatal care across the affected areas, for example through the use of mobile integrated reproductive health services. These services also support organizations in identifying and serving those in need of protection assistance, such as survivors of gender based violence.

### 2.2.3 Specialized Services

KIs continue to report a significant gap in specialized services for persons with disabilities and older persons. 87% of KIs stated that there are no specialized services available for persons with disabilities in their area. Considering the continued movement of IDPs into Northwest Syria during the monitoring period, and external reports that indicate a growing number of physically impaired and disabled civilians and the insufficiency of the services and support available to them (AAR Japan, 2017), there is a significant need to scale up and expand dedicated and specialized services. Disabilities that result in lack of or reduction in mobility may result in additional challenges in accessing food, water, non-food items, and other vital humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian actors responsible for providing basic humanitarian assistance must specifically plan logistics, transportation, and access to ensure that persons with specialized needs—the sick and disabled, as well as the elderly—have equal and sufficient access to these resources.
2.2.4 Access to Water

Overall, water trucks (for purchase) emerge as the primary source of water, followed by the public network, wells, and water trucks (NGOs). In off-camp locations, water trucks (for purchase) emerged as the leading source, while camp residents predominantly rely upon free water through water trucks provided by NGOs for their water needs.
Overall, 35% of all KIs stated that the community does not face any challenges in accessing water, while 28% stated some, 23% stated most and 14% stated all. Off-camp based KIs were more likely to state that most or all of the community faces challenges in accessing water.
While unavailability of water was cited as the primary challenge for in-camp residents, the cost of water was cited as such for off-camp community members. Water that is polluted and unclean also continues to be a problem among monitored communities.
All KIs in A’zaz district of Aleppo stated that water is unavailable. All KIs in Tell Abiad district of Ar-Raqqa stated that water is polluted and unclean. All KIs in Quamishli district of Al-Hasakeh governorate stated that water is either unavailable or polluted/unclean. Security concerns were noted as a barrier to accessing water for Jisr-Ash-Shugur district of Idleb governorate.
Half of responding KIs in Ar-Rastan district of Homs stated that some WASH infrastructure had been damaged by conflict activity in the recent period. KIs in Ar-Rastan explained that the water tanks of the community were damaged by shelling, and the main pumping station of the public water network for these communities is located in areas controlled by the GoS.

Most of the water storage has been damaged by the war and there is a problem of water access for the community as a whole. The area’s main pumping station is located in areas loyal to the regime (Male KII, Off-Camp, NGO Staff, Ar-Rastan District, Homs Governorate).

In Muhradah district of Hama, the shelling damaged wells and the public network, leaving much of the community without access to water during periods of high conflict activity.

All the artesian wells that fed the city with water were shelled, in addition to the water network, severely damaging them. [...] It deprived residents of clean drinking water that earlier used to reach houses. Now, either water tanks are purchased or water runs intermittently through the public network (Male KII, Off-Camp, Head of Farmer Association, Muhradah District, Hama Governorate).

Ongoing conflict and security incidents in Idleb governorate also impacted the water network in some of its communities, for example in Ariha district.

[The] water network in the city was damaged because of the security situation; this led to people having to rely on buying water to meet their needs (Male KII, Off-Camp, Agricultural Engineer, Ariha District, Idleb Governorate).

### 2.2.5 Humanitarian Assistance

Has the Community Received Humanitarian Assistance in the Recent Period?

- None
- Some
- Most
- All
- Unable to Answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humanitarian assistance includes food, water, NFI, cash, medical, PSS, counseling or other protection assistance. KIs in off-camp locations were far more likely to state that no one in the community or only some of the community had received humanitarian assistance, while in-camp KIs were more likely to state that most or all of the community received assistance. This difference is of course due to the systematic and comprehensive nature of organized humanitarian assistance in IDP camps.
Communities in areas hosting IDP camps and with greater presence of humanitarian actors have received more humanitarian assistance.

Off-camp KIs were less likely to state that there are no challenges in receiving humanitarian assistance, and were more likely to state that the community members experience discrimination/exclusion than in-camp KIs. Protection monitoring findings consistently indicate that off-camp community members perceive themselves to be disadvantaged in terms of access to humanitarian assistance when compared to in-camp KIs.

This perception is most likely caused by the more regular distribution of humanitarian assistance to IDPs in sites. Humanitarian organizations can help mitigate this perception by ensuring that humanitarian assistance distribution is based upon need and prioritized for in-need, vulnerable, and at-risk members of the community. The clear communication of eligibility requirements and the underlying principles which determine prioritization can also help reduce misconceptions about access to humanitarian assistance. This is also essential in protecting and maintaining the neutral and impartial stance of humanitarian organizations, and their reputation within the organizations in which
they work. Establishment and maintenance of trust in humanitarian organizations active within the community is not only essential for the security of humanitarian staff, but it also ensures that community members will reach out these organizations when they face protection risks and needs.

It is noted that while the request of sexual favor or exploitation for humanitarian assistance is not frequently identified in this report, GBV-focused analysis of FGDs as well as the KI interviews conducted in 2017 for the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) identified this to be a common issue, particularly affecting women and girls who are trying to access aid (Voices From Syria, 2018). Humanitarian organizations are recommended to review their Protection Against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) policies to ensure that it meets the minimum standards defined by the United Nations Secretary General, and ensure that every staff member is familiar with the policy. Please refer to UN General Assembly Report of the Secretary General “Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse” (2017) for guidance.

Among “other” challenges, KIs frequently mentioned how the assistance was reserved for a specific group of people. However, the perception of who is being prioritized for humanitarian assistance in the community varies among the key-informants. Some KIs mentioned that the aid is only for displaced people and that it is often insufficient in quantity to meet all need. Other KIs stated that new IDPs are not included in the humanitarian assistance (specifically in the case of monthly food basket distribution). Humanitarian organizations are encouraged to continue to prioritize vulnerable and most in-need persons for assistance, irrespective of their status as IDPs or host community. Humanitarian organizations can also improve communication about the nature of humanitarian assistance distribution criteria in order to mitigate many of these concerns.

Aside from the perceptions of communities about humanitarian assistance provision, the humanitarian sector must also engage in discussions regarding the long-term effects of reliance on humanitarian assistance, and must brainstorm and implement alternative solutions to the massive needs in north and northwestern Syria, such as emergency livelihood creation projects. Livelihood creation within the emergency context will help generate economic and survival opportunities for these communities and reduce reliance on humanitarian assistance.

Livelihoods projects are better received and more successful if humanitarian assistance continues to meet the basic needs of communities during the transition. Livelihood projects must take into consideration the needs, preferences and skills of the affected communities to ensure that they are useful and sustainable.

2.2.6 Access to Markets

![Diagram: Do Community Members Have Safe Access to Markets?](chart)
KIs in in-camp locations reported slightly better access to markets than those in off-camp locations. Overall, female and male KIs reported safe access to markets at similar levels.
Reasons for restrictions on safe access varied by location. A KI from Al Bab stated that access is restricted by the unavailability of transportation to markets. In A’zaz, the market is too far away from the community. In Jebel Saman, the community fears harm due to explosions and conflict due to factional fighting, or artillery shelling from GoS-held areas. In Quamishli, fear of recruitment and forced conscription restricts young people’s access to the market. KIs from Tell Abiad explained that community members are afraid of bombing and checkpoints. KIs in As-Salamiyeh explained that the village experiences clashes and shelling almost on a daily basis, and only houses that are closest to the markets can access it due to the security situation. KIs in Ar-Rastan stated that several different factors affect the community’s access to markets. Part of the issue is that the nearest market is located far away, and travel to the market requires passing through checkpoints. The other issue is that as crowded places often experience bombardment or shelling, community members cannot go to the market due to fear of their security. KIs in Ariha also stated that the cause is security concerns and fear of shelling. In Harim district, KIs stated that community members experience fear of security risks such as fear of explosions and conflict between armed factions, fear of kidnapping, and fear of theft, which restricts their safe access to markets.

There are no markets in the area and the nearest market is a long distance away. Due to the spread of checkpoints on the public roads, we cannot move about freely to access the markets (Female KII, Off-Camp, NGO Staff, Ar-Rastan District, Homs Governorate).
2.2.7 Access to Electricity

Basic Needs - Indicator 2.7
Prevalence of Challenges in Accessing Electricity

Do Community Members Have Access to Electricity in the Area?

- None: 7%
- Between 3-6 Hours/Day: 16%
- Continuously: 56%
- Less than 3 Hours/Day: 20%
- Between 6-12 Hours/Day: 1%
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Only 1% of KIs stated that community members have continuous access to electricity in their area. In Al Bab district of Aleppo, all KIs stated that the community either has no electricity whatsoever or only has electricity for less than three hours per day. Similarly, in Muhradah district of Hama, and Ar-Rastan and Homs districts of Homs governorate, at least half of KIs stated that the community has either no electricity or has less than three hours per day. Many of the KIs in districts of Idleb stated that the community has between three to six hours of electricity per day.

**Do Community Members Have Access to Electricity in the Area?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate-District</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Between 3-6 Hours/Day</th>
<th>Continuously</th>
<th>Less than 3 Hours/Day</th>
<th>Between 6-12 Hours/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Bab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’zaz</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesel Samaan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Malkeyyeh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qamishli</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Abiad</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Raqqa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Rastan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Ma’ra</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Rafid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlib</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarash-Shugur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Do Community Members Access Electricity?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>% of 1105 Responding KIs Identifying Each Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Generator</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Generator</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Network</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared generators and solar energy are the first two sources of electricity for monitored communities, followed closely by private generators and the public network. While in-camp community members rely more heavily on shared generators and solar energy for electricity, off-camp communities rely more heavily on private generators and the public network.

**2.2.8 Access to Housing and Shelter**

In What Type of Shelters Do IDPs Live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Shelter</th>
<th>% of 1007 KIs Identifying Each Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid/Finished House</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished Building</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid/Finished Apartment</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential/Public Building</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solid/finished house is the most common type of shelter for IDPs in monitored communities. In districts where there are higher concentrations of IDPs, as well as frequent IDP movements, communities rely on a variety of shelter types, most likely due to limited availability of solid/finished houses and apartments in these communities caused by high demand. Therefore, residing in unfinished buildings or non-residential/public buildings is more common in these communities. Among “other,” KIs most often refer to tents, camps, and temporary shelters.

Although off-campus KIs are more likely to state that either some or most of the community pays rent for their accommodation, in-campus KIs also noted that IDPs in some camps pay rent. This includes camps located on both public and privately-owned land.
Do Families in the Community Pay Rent for the Camp or Accommodation?

What Are the Top Three Most Common HLP Problems in the Community in the Recent Period?
Key informants were asked to identify the top three most common HLP problems experienced in their community in the recent period. 23% of all KIs stated that there are HLP problems in the community in the recent period. KIs indicated inheritance issues (10%), lack or loss of HLP documentation (10%), ownership disputes (7%) and rent disputes (6%) as the most prominent HLP issues. Female and male KIs identified these problems in similar percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate-District</th>
<th>Al Bab</th>
<th>A'az</th>
<th>Jebel Saman</th>
<th>Al-Malkeyyeh</th>
<th>Quamishli</th>
<th>Tell Abiad</th>
<th>As-Salamiyeh</th>
<th>As-Suqaylabiyah</th>
<th>Muhradah</th>
<th>Ar Rastan</th>
<th>Homs</th>
<th>Al Ma'ra</th>
<th>Arha</th>
<th>Harim</th>
<th>Idlib</th>
<th>Jisr-Ash-Shugur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of 1185 KIs Identifying Each Option</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many disputes arise over ownership, rent or inheritance among individuals in this community, especially in the absence of an effective and specialized judicial authority and in the absence of enforcement of the rule of law (Male KII, Off-Camp, NGO-Staff, Idleb District, Idlib Governorate).

In A'az, KIs explained that HLP disputes in the community are due to lack or loss of HLP documentation. In Jebel Saman district, some KIs explained that there are not many HLP disputes because property is generally registered with their owners. Some KIs stated that there are family inheritance issues and unlawful occupation of property which often happens if there is a shift in lines of control. One KI in Jebel Saman district stated that whenever a different armed faction takes control of a community, they occupy and confiscate the property considered to belong to a rival armed faction.

KIs from Al-Malkeyyeh district of Al-Hasakeh stated that some land in the area was expropriated and allocated to other families.

In As-Salamiyeh district of Hama, KIs stated that there are HLP-related issues and disputes in the community, but that they all pre-date the conflict and are not caused by conflict conditions.
In Ar-Rastan district of Homs governorate, several KIs mentioned disputes about rent and one KI noted the lack of a land registry that would attest to proof of ownership.

In Al Ma’ra District of Idleb, KIs stated that the community is well aware of property ownership in the community, and therefore no problems and disputes arise. In Ariha, some community members have been experiencing disputes over inheritance. The specific issue that was mentioned was that some family members who were owners of property are missing and although they are suspected to have died, as there is no certain information about them, their family members and remaining heirs are unable to own or sell the property. One KI also noted the absence of effective judicial authorities to deal with inheritance disputes. In Harim district, a location with high concentration of IDPs, KIs stated that there are no HLP problems because IDPs do not own any property in the area. The only disputes that arise may be due to rent. Two KIs in Harim also mentioned that the camp land in which IDPs reside in the community was purchased by the IDPs and is now owned by them and they have property documentation of ownership.

In Idleb district, the most commonly mentioned issue by KIs was boundary disputes. Several KIs also mentioned that there are inter-family disputes between siblings over inheritance, and that sometimes male family members deny inheritance rights to female family members. Additionally, the lack of a judicial authority to resolve these disputes was mentioned.

Humanitarian actors engaging in camp management and shelter programs can help reduce these risks by ensuring that land used for camp and shelter establishment is verified, reliable, and sustainable for IDPs and affected communities, and have basic and essential amenities (Refer to Shelter/NFI Cluster Due Diligence Guidelines).

2.2.9 Access to Employment

13% of KIs stated that no men in the community have access to employment. 70% stated that some, 14% stated that most, and only 3% stated that all men in the community have access to employment in the community.

Al-Malikeyeh and Quamishli districts of Al-Hasakah governorate appear to be doing much better in terms of men’s access to employment compared to other monitored areas. 50% or more of the KIs in these districts stated that all men have access to employment. While a majority of KIs in all other monitored districts were likely to state that some men in the community have access to employment, Al Bab and Jebel Saman districts of Aleppo and Art-Rastan district of Homs appear to be experiencing greater problems in this area. According to KIs, access to employment is fairly limited for men in communities which are densely populated and which host a high number of IDPs. This is especially true of Aleppo and Idleb governorates. Considering that reliance upon humanitarian assistance is also high in these communities, it is important for humanitarian actors to increase focus on livelihood generation projects.
19% of KIs stated that no women in the community have access to employment. 72% stated that some women have access, 8% stated that most women have access and only 1% stated that all women have access to employment.
Access to employment is even a greater challenge for women in the community. Quamishli district is the only location where a considerable number of KIs stated that all women in the community have access to employment. In other communities, the majority of KIs stated that only some women in the community have access to employment.

KIs state that the lack of employment opportunities is the primary restriction on accessing employment for both women and men in the community. Factors such as education not being recognized, security concerns and the inability to return to public service impact men and women similarly in terms of accessing employment. However, women continue to experience additional barriers to employment in the form of restrictions imposed by their family or spouse, fear of stigma and social restrictions in general.

FGDs conducted by a Protection Cluster member with women in these locations during the same reporting period highlight the numerous challenges experienced by women in regards to work and economic opportunities. These challenges particularly affect female-headed households. 65% of 49 women who participated in FGDs stated that they can only find part-time, intermittent or seasonal employment, and earn no more than 5000 Syrian Pounds (SYP) (less than 10 USD) per month. In the case of seasonal agricultural work, this income is only available during certain months of the year.

However, these FGDs indicate that many women are unable to participate in even the above mentioned limited work opportunities due to social stigma and the pressure placed upon women by relatives, neighbors and communities. Women also often hold caregiving responsibilities for younger children and other relatives in the family, which are additionaly factors that prevent them from participating in the work force.

Due to these economic, social, and personal barriers to accessing employment and income, women often rely upon negative coping mechanisms, including child labor. Approximately 30% of 49 women who participated in FGDs stated that their children work (IRC, Protection Monitoring Northwest Syria, May 2018).
2.3 Vulnerability

Amidst generalized violence and barriers to accessing basic items and services, conflict has placed persons with specific needs at risk of additional protection risks. Data indicates that communities fear greater risk of harm for not only women, girls, boys, persons with disabilities, and older persons, but also for men. Communities take certain self-precautions and resort to certain harmful coping mechanisms in order to reduce these risks for community members.

2.3.1 Risks for Children

The PMTF questions on child protection are part of a two-pronged approach where the PTMF maps the overall protection risks faced by children while the Child Protection Monitoring Task Force (CPMTF) complements this information by zooming into the following three areas: psychosocial needs, child labor and child separation. For additional information, please refer to CPMTF’s framework and dashboard[^5].

Overall, 49% of KIs stated that no children in the community are affected or at risk of violence and exploitation. 43% stated “some children,” 7% stated “most children,” and 1% were unable to answer.

In terms of risk of violence or exploitation for children in in-camp versus off-camp locations, there are no significant differences. KIs in off-camp locations were slightly more likely to state that some children in the community are at risk while KIs in in-camp locations were slightly more likely to state that most children in the community are at risk.
Child labor continues to be the primary risk of violence and exploitation affecting children in monitored communities. The risk was equally identified by in-camp and off-camp, and female and male KIs for children in the community. Further information on child labor can be found in section 3.3.4. Following child labor, physical neglect was indicated as the second most prevalent risk affecting children. A few KIs identified remaining risks such as abuse/harassment, kidnapping, substance abuse, trafficking, smuggling, other and detention/arrest. In-camp KIs were slightly more likely to identify the risk of abuse/harassment for children than off-camp KIs. Off-camp KIs, on the other hand, were slightly more likely to indicate the risks of kidnapping/abduction and substance abuse for children. Recruitment of children by armed groups also emerged in the findings.
Because of the difficult living conditions they experience, some families have pushed their children to work to earn money and help the family (Male KII, Off-Camp, Teacher, Al Ma’ra District, Idlib Governorate).

Findings by area indicate that child labor and physical neglect is perceived to be primary risks in all monitored locations. The risk of kidnapping/abduction was indicated for districts of Jebel Saman, As-Salamiyeh, Harim and Idlib. The risk of substance abuse was indicated for Jebel Saman, As-Salamiyeh and Harim. The risk of trafficking/smuggling was indicated for Al-Malikeyah and As-Salamiyeh and at a lesser percentage, in Harim. The risk of detention/arrest was noted for Jebel Saman, Harim and Idlib districts.

Key informants who elaborated on the type of risks that children in the community face provided the following descriptions.

In Al Ma’ra district, KIs explained that due to the financial difficulty experienced by families, families often push or encourage their children to leave school and join the work force in order to support their families. In these jobs, they are required to work long working hours for low wages. One KI stated that some families send their children to Turkey in order to work and support the family who remains in Syria.

In [location withheld from report], KIs stated that children in the community are recruited to armed factions who exploit and abuse them in a variety of ways. These children are often offered salaries and incentives. They are taught to engage in alcohol and drug abuse and are required to engage in illegal and dangerous activities such as stealing/looting, selling of stolen/looted items and smuggling for the armed faction. One KI stated that children are given alcohol and drugs to desensitize them.

The responses from [location withheld from report] also indicate that families are aware of their children’s affiliation with armed groups. Some families initially permitted this because of the need for income, and also with the assumption that children would contribute to the protection and safety of the village. One KI stated that the families
did not predict that the children would become addicted to alcohol and drugs and engage in illegal activities like stealing.

KIs in Idleb and Jebel Saman districts mentioned incidents of kidnapping/abduction or attempted kidnapping/abduction of young children.

The findings on risks experienced by children, and FGDs conducted with women in NW Syria during the same monitoring period indicate a strong correlation between risks experienced by women in the community, particularly female-headed households, and risks experienced by children (refer to IRC Protection Monitoring Report for Northwest Syria for May 2018 for additional information).

As Syrian women experience greater protection risks such as security risks, risks of sexual violence and exploitation, and economic hardship and inability to work due to numerous familial, social, and economic reasons, the more heavily they rely upon negative coping mechanisms which impact children – predominately child labor for boys and early marriage for girls. Therefore, it is emphasized that findings on risks experienced by children be considered in relation to the risks experienced by women in the community. These findings continue to call for integrated approaches to protection. The protection risks experienced by children can be reduced through integrated programming targeting both women and children.

For example, awareness raising that impacts the community’s negative perceptions about women who are widowed, divorced, or single, and women who work to support their families can help reduce the barriers to women’s employment, thereby reducing the reliance on child labor in these families. The findings of FGDs conducted by the IRC with female headed households indicates that many female headed households resort to early marriage for girls due to financial reasons (IRC Protection Monitoring Northwestern Syria, May 2018). Therefore, improvement in the financial situation of female-headed households may reduce the prevalence of early marriage. Both donors and humanitarian actors are recommended to consider the underlying causes of protections risks which they wish to influence through their programming, and where possible, to implement more integrated approaches that simultaneously target more than one vulnerable group in the community. For example, combining women-based programming with child protection programming can be more effective in reducing protection risks for the community than implementing one type of programming standalone.

### 2.3.2 Impact of Conflict on Children’s Psychological Wellbeing

KIs were asked whether children in the community had in the recent period displayed behavioral changes indicative of emotional distress, such as isolation, non-participation in social activities, finger-sucking, bedwetting, extreme fear, shyness, anxiety, aggression, irregular sleep patterns, and learning difficulties. Overall, 56% of KIs stated that none of the children in the community displayed behavioral changes. 35% stated that some, 6% stated that most, and 0% stated that all children display such behavioral changes.

KIs who provided explanations for the types of behavioral changes observed in children in the community mentioned a variety of behaviors and emotions experienced by children, such as fear, anxiety, withdrawal and extreme shyness.
(not engaging in social interaction and play), hostility/aggression, insomnia, bedwetting, biting nails, thumb sucking, extreme sensitivity to and fear of loud noises and darkness, inability to concentrate/learning difficulties.

Some KIs, for example in Al Ma’ra district of Idleb, noted that the improvement of the security situation and the reduction of clashes, shelling, and violence has improved the psychological condition of children, thereby reducing indications of emotional distress. However, KIs in other areas, such as Ar-Rastan district of Homs, stated that although the security situation is calmer at present, children continue to suffer psychologically from the effects of war and conflict experienced previously.

This is a noteworthy difference in the findings, which indicates that children in some communities are recovering better and faster than children in other communities. Considering that Idleb governorate has a higher presence of protection and education actors which provide child-focused services such as child-friendly spaces, education support, PSS support to children and adults, is likely to be a primary factor. Organizations are highly encouraged to expand their children and PSS services to remote, harder-to-reach areas and communities where families and children may have never been exposed to PSS support and/or lack access to child-friendly spaces. In the upcoming period, it is important for child focused programming to prioritize communities that have not been previously served.

2.3.3 Child Separation

![Chart](chart.png)
2.3.4 Child Labor

Vulnerability - Indicator 3.2
Prevalence of Child Labor

Are There Children (under 18 years of age) That Are Working in this Community?

- None: 7%
- Some: 73%
- Most: 20%
- All: 0%
- Unable to Answer: 1%
7% of all KIs stated that no children are working in the community. The majority, 73%, stated that some children are working, and 20% stated that most children are working in the community. KIs in in-camp and off-camp locations indicated child labor in similar percentages.

With the exception of Al Bab district, nearly all KIs from every district stated that either some or most children in the community are working. KIs indicated that children work in a variety of jobs and occupations such as agricultural labor, shepherding and raising livestock, construction labor, industry/manufacturing, salespersons (both freelance and employed by shops), car repair and maintenance workers, and skilled labor such as blacksmith, carpentry, and baking. Additionally, KIs state that some children beg for a living, some children travel to Turkey for work, and some children are affiliated with armed groups.
2.3.5 Violence and Exploitation in Child Labor

Are Children That Are Working Being Mistreated?

- None 56%
- Some 28%
- Most 5%
- All 11%
- Unable to Answer 0%

56% of KIs stated that no working children are being mistreated. 28% stated that some are being mistreated and 5% stated that most of them are being mistreated.

KIs’ explanations and descriptions for the kind of challenges and risks that children are exposed to in their work really demonstrates the severity of both physical and psychological risks and harm endured by these children. KIs state that children engage in work that is greatly disproportionate to their physical build and capacity, often having to carry extremely heavy materials, and being forced to work very long hours that places their health and well-being in danger. They receive low and incommensurate wages. Children are also exposed to systemic verbal and sometimes physical abuse and bullying at workplaces, which negatively impact their psychological state.

Due to the financial and social challenges that conflict has created in affected communities, many children have had to discontinue their education in order to work and support the family financially, carrying a large responsibility for a child. It is expected that the changes and conditions experienced by conflict-affected children will result in long-term effects on their physical and emotional development and psychological well-being. The effects on development and wellness of children’s affiliation with armed groups are even more devastating due to their exposure to extreme violence, fear, as well as alcohol and drug abuse.

For humanitarian organizations, one of the challenges that is often experienced is the access to children who are most vulnerable and at most risk. Child focused humanitarian programming provides invaluable service through child-friendly spaces, educational institutions, community centers and health centers. However, it must also be recognized that the most affected and vulnerable children who engage in child labor, who experience early marriage, or who are affiliated with armed groups cannot be reached through these mediums. The long-standing challenge is to access children who are most affected by these risks, and brainstorm additional ways in which these children could be supported and served. Humanitarian assistance and protection services aim to reduce harm and the impact of violence. Root causes of protection risks in conflict are complex and require different levels of intervention, which only some are in the scope of humanitarian actors.
2.3.6 Services for Persons with Special Needs and Older Persons

KIs were asked to state whether there are any dedicated services for people with special needs in their communities, including boys and girls at risk, unaccompanied and separated children (UASC), persons with serious health conditions, persons with special legal/physical protection needs, single women, female headed households, older persons and persons with disabilities.

94% of all KIs stated that there are no dedicated services for special needs. 98% of all KIs stated that there are no dedicated services for older persons.

A variety of factors appear to be contributing to the gap in services for special needs. Foremost, as seen in the above chart, very few of monitored communities have expertise and dedicated services for special needs.

Key-informants described the following available services and service points. In Jebel Saman district of Aleppo, a physical therapy and PSS support center was opened for community members with special needs. In Quamishli district of Al-Hasakeh, KIs stated that there are several centers for people with special needs, and one which serves children.
with special needs such as autism and physical disability. In As-Salamiyeh district of Hama, there is a small center for people with special needs, however KIs state that the center’s services are not sufficient for the needs of the community. In Al Ma’ra, there is one center that provides assistance to people with special needs. In Harim district, KIs state that there are organizations providing services for people with disabilities and special needs such as wheelchairs and education and PSS support. In Idleb district, KIs state that an office of the local council provides support to widows in the community. There are also PSS services and courses with focus on children with special needs, as well as a center that serves community members with disabilities such as visual and auditory disabilities, down syndrome, autism and quadriplegia. One KI in Jisr-Ash-Shugr stated that only medication is provided to persons with special needs in the community and that they do not have access to any other services or assistance, not even wheelchairs. No dedicated services for special needs was noted for remaining monitored districts.

In order to fill the gap in specialized needs service provision and better manage the use of existing services, humanitarian organizations are highly encouraged to implement the following recommendations. There is a need to have better assessment of disability rates and needs in communities. Existing community centers and safe spaces must also be disabled-friendly spaces. Community members with special needs and disabilities can be supported to access these spaces through basic steps such as targeted transportation assistance, and by making the entrances of buildings accessible to wheelchairs. Disability awareness can be integrated both into training of humanitarian staff and into awareness sessions with community members and leaders, which will particularly combat social stigmas experienced by persons with special needs. Humanitarian actors with health programming can provide direct guidance and support to families in adapting their homes for easy access to disabled family members. Humanitarian organizations can advocate and promote the provision of equal opportunities to persons with special needs and disabilities in existing livelihood and vocational programs (IRC, Protection Monitoring Northwest Syria, June 2018).

It is necessary for all organizations, including those without specialized programming, to have up-to-date service mapping with contact information of organizations that provide specialized services in their area, and undertake referrals to these organizations when possible. Humanitarian organizations should not hesitate to reach out to and inform the Protection Cluster of any gaps in service mapping or specialized service provision so that they can receive the needed support.

2.4 Demographic Groups and Movements

Security is the major factor influencing movement and displacement, which remain frequent and vast. In addition, all demographic groups experience restrictions on freedom of movement within the community. Not only generalized violence from armed combat, but also smaller and specific criminalized activity affects freedom of movement. Insufficient or nonexistent rule of law, disintegration of community structures, high strain on limited resources, proliferation of weapons, and the negative psychological consequences experienced by members of society because of high-intensity, long-duration conflict are all factors in the deterioration of security (WoS Protection Needs Overview, 2018).

2.4.1 Freedom of Movement / Movement Restrictions

*Restrictions and impact for men and boys:*

| Are Men and Boys Able to Move Freely in the Community? |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
|                  | None     | Some     | Most     | All      | Unable to Answer |
| 3%               | 10%      | 15%      | 72%      |          |                 |
72% of all KIs stated that men and boys are able to move freely in the community. 15% stated that most are able to move freely, 10% stated that some are able to move freely and 3% stated that none are able to move freely in the community. Of the KIs who stated that some, most and none are able to move freely, the causes of restricted movement mentioned most were: general violence (32%), fear of airstrikes/clashes (28%), the presence of checkpoints in the community (27%), activities of armed groups (25%), fear of arrest (16%), restrictions imposed by family/spouse (13%), presence of explosive hazards (10%).

Restrictions and impact for women and girls:

68% of all KIs stated that women and girls are able to move freely in the community. 15% stated that most are able, 14% stated that some are able and 4% stated that no women and girls are able to move freely in the community.
The primary factors impacting women and girls’ ability to move freely in the community differ from factors impacting men and boys’ freedom of movement. While women and girls are also impacted by security concerns such as general violence, fear of airstrikes/clashes and activities of armed groups, the primary factors affecting women and girls’ movement are restrictions imposed by their family/spouse and the fear of stigma and other social restrictions. Both male and female KIs perceive these to be the primary factors for women and girls’ movement restrictions. It is interesting to note that male KIs were more likely to perceive security concerns as a restriction to women and girls’ freedom of movement than female KIs. Female KIs were significantly more likely to report fear of kidnapping and robbery, and harassment in public places as restriction to women and girls’ free movement than male KIs.
2.4.2 IDP Movement

The below section reviews findings that explain causes of IDP movements in monitored communities. It is noted that most IDP populations monitored through this and other assessments in North, Northwest and Northeast Syria have experienced more than one displacement. The survey used by the Protection Monitoring Task Force defines arrivals as IDPs newly arriving to a community for the first time, departures as IDPs newly departing from a community for the first time, and returnees as IDPs who are returning to their place of origin after a previous displacement.
46% of KIs stated that there had been arrivals to their location in the recent period. 52% of KIs stated that there have not been recent arrivals to their location.

More than half of KIs in the following locations stated that there have been arrivals: Al-Malikeyeh and Quamishli districts of Al-Hasakeh Governorate, Tell Abiad district of Ar-Raqqa, Muhradah district of Hama, Ar-Rastan and Homs districts of Homs, Al Ma’ra and Ariha districts of Idleb governorate.
According to 78% of KIs who indicated recent arrivals in their area, the displaced left their previous locations because of security concerns. Other reasons include threat of violence (36%), improved security situation in the current location (20%), property loss or damage (19%), to evade recruitment (11%), economic hardship (7%), other (7%), lack of services/infrastructure (3%) and lack of humanitarian relief (2%).

KIs in Quamishli stated that IDPs from Afrin arrived to their location due to the shelling taking place in Afrin. In As-Salamiyeh, KIs stated that there have been arrivals from the village of Tal al-Durra due to the shelling that took place there. KIs in Ar-Rastan stated that some IDPs arrived to the area due to the shelling taking place in Brigitte and Jumalikale areas. Additionally, due to the change in control of some villages such as Taqses and Domina, young men fled to Ar-Rastan to avoid conscription by the GoS. In all districts of Idlib governorate, many of the arrivals to the area during this period were from Eastern Ghouta. Additionally, KIs in Idlib governorate noted some arrivals from villages which experienced a poor security situation and violence including shelling and control by GoS.
Returnees

81% of all KIs stated that there have not been any IDP returns to their location in the recent period, while 14% stated that there have been and 6% were unable to answer.

At least some KIs reported IDP returns across nearly all monitored communities, as can be observed in the following chart.
According to KIs who indicated that there had been returnees to their location in the recent period, people left their previous location due to security concerns in the previous location (51%), improved security in the current location (44%), economic hardship (10%), property loss/damage (6%), threat of violence (6%), to evade recruitment (6%), lack of services/infrastructure (5%), other (2%), and due to unavailability of humanitarian relief (2%) in the previous location.

One KI in Al Bab stated that some IDPs have returned due to lack of adequate housing in their previous location.

KIs in As-Salamiyeh stated that some families have returned after an improvement in the security situation in order to reclaim and farm their agricultural land, especially because of the high costs and economic hardship they experienced in their previous location. The desire to engage in agricultural work was also mentioned by one KI in Idleb district who stated that some IDPs returned to the area only to work during the agricultural season and later left the area.

In Jebel Saman district, KIs stated that some of the residents who had been displaced to nearby villages during inter-factional fighting returned to the area after the violence ceased.

**Departures**

69% of KIs stated that there have not been any departures from their locations recently, while 26% stated that there have been departures, and 4% were unable to answer.
More than half of KIs in the following districts stated that there have been departures from their location recently: Al Bab and Jebel Saman districts of Aleppo, and Ar-Rastan and Homs districts of Homs governorate. Departures were also noted for some districts of Idleb governorate.

One KI in Al Bab stated that there have been departures from their camp recently because of heat and gender segregation within the camp.

In Al Mara, KIs stated that some families returned to their villages of origin because of the improvement in the security situation in their area of origin, in addition to the poor living conditions and lack of housing and employment in the displacement location.
In Ar-Rastan, KIs stated that their communities were forcibly displaced to Northern Syria by the GoS. This is consistent with negotiations for a local agreement between AOGs and GoS in Ar-Rastan during this period (WHO Syria Weekly Update, 30 March - 4 April 2018).

In As-Salamiyeh, KIs stated that those who left did so in order to seek livelihood and job opportunities, and also in order to send their children to school.

In As-Suqaylabiyah district, KIs stated that the community had IDPs from Eastern Ghouta, Rural Damascus and Hama but these IDPs left after a short period. While some KIs stated that they do not know where the IDPs went, several KIs stated that the IDPs left for Northern Syria and Afrin where they have relatives and acquaintances.

In Harim district, several KIs stated that there have been some departures of IDPs to GoS controlled areas and to A’zaz district.

In Homs district, KIs stated that people residing in a section of the northern Homs countryside were displaced to Northern Syria by the GoS. The findings are consistent with a local agreement signed between an non-state armed groups and the GoS in Homs in May 2018. Additionally, some families also left the community because homeowners returned to their home and the families needed to seek new housing.

In Idleb district, KIs stated that some IDPs returned to their villages in the eastern countryside, some families went to Afrin as they believe it to be more secure, and some IDPs left for Turkey to seek work.

In Jebel Saman, KIs explained that IDPs have departed as a result of cessation of violence in their areas of origin. Some of the departures were also caused by interfactional fighting taking place in the district.
2.5 Explosive Hazards, Security Incidents, and Community Structures

2.5.1 Explosive Hazards

Incidents - Indicator 5.1
Prevalence of Contamination with Explosive Hazards

Is the Community Contaminated with Explosive Hazards?

- None: 81%
- Some: 13%
- Most: 1%
- All: 2%
- Unable to Answer: 3%
81% of KIs indicated that their community is not affected by explosive hazards, including mines and other explosive remnants of war. 13% stated that some of the community is contaminated, 1% stated that most of the community is contaminated and 2% indicated that all of their community is contaminated with explosive hazards. 3% were unable to answer. It is noted that KIs may be identifying visible or recent explosive hazards and actual contamination levels may be different – and largely higher - than what is perceived and identified by the community.

A considerable percentage of KIs in the following districts stated that some of the community is contaminated with explosive hazards: As-Salamiyeh district of Hama, Al Ma’ra district and Jisr-Ash-Shugur districts of Idleb governorate. A large percentage of KIs in Ar-Rastan district of Homs governorate stated that all of the community is contaminated with explosive hazards.

During the same reporting period of April - June 2018, Clash Data findings indicated the following number of reported explosive hazard incidents: 1053 in Aleppo, 415 in Al Hasakeh, 155 in Ar-Raqqa, 2923 in Hama, 1080 in Homs, 1594 in Idleb and 1307 in Rural Damascus governorates. These findings are consistent with PMTF findings in which KIs in some districts of Hama, Homs and Idleb governorates were more likely to state that their community is contaminated with explosive hazards. These findings do not indicate confirmed explosive hazard contamination and only potential contamination. Humanitarian actors seeking data on risks in specific locations can contact the humanitarian Mine Action Sub-Cluster for information.
Key informants described the following types of security incidents during this monitoring period:

Aleppo Governorate: In Al Bab district, KIs described cases of theft and clashes. One KI mentioned an incident of armed clashes during a meal distribution. In Az’az, there was mention of theft, interpersonal disputes, as well as disputes over water. In Jebel Saman, KIs mentioned armed clashes between factions, theft, robbery, kidnapping, family disputes.

Al-Hasakeh Governorate: In Qamishli district, KIs mentioned shelling, family disputes and theft.

Ar-Raqqa Governorate: In Tell Abiad, 3 KIs mentioned an assassination.

Hama Governorate: In As-Salamiyeh and As-Suqaylabiyah districts, KIs stated that there are incidents of theft.
Homs Governorate: In Ar-Rastan and Homs, KIs mentioned cases of theft and robbery, as well as some clashes between armed factions and shelling.

Idleb Governorate: In Al Ma’ra district, KIs mentioned clashes between armed groups, an interpersonal dispute with resulted in death, and theft incidents. In Ariha, KIs mentioned clashes between armed groups a wave of assassinations and murder, and theft. In Harim district, KIs mentioned clashes between armed groups, theft, looting, kidnapping and extortion, theft of public and private properties such as solar panels, motor vehicles, shop items and food. One KI stated that there is kidnapping for the purposes of ransom and for organ trafficking. In Jebel Saman district, KIs mentioned clashes between armed groups, theft and robbery, inter-personal dispute, kidnapping for ransom, and murder.

2.5.3 Community Structures

70% of KIs stated that there is a community structure, organization, association or group of leaders that meets or is organized to discuss and address issues and needs of the community. 27% stated that there is no such structure, and 3% were unable to answer.

KIs stating that there is a community structure indicated the following structures. Local council was mentioned the greatest number of times (560), followed by the Shura Council (40), police (25), village elders (23), and Shari’a Court (1).
84% of KIs who indicated that they have a community structure that addresses issues and needs of the community identified the oversight or management of humanitarian assistance as one of its purposes. 52% stated its purpose to be dispute resolution between community members, 51% stated oversight or management of access to public utilities such as water and electricity, 50% stated advocacy for community needs, 21% stated oversight of public security, and 10% stated protection of vulnerable community members.

Around 20% of KIs stated that all of the community feels that the community structure is legitimate, representative and useful. Around 65% of KIs stated that most of the community feels that the structure is legitimate, representative and useful. The remaining 13-16% stated that none of the community members feel this way about the community structure.
Does the Community Feel That the Structure is Legitimate?

- **Female KL**
  - None: 0%
  - Some: 11%
  - Most: 44%
  - All: 19%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%

- **Male KL**
  - None: 2%
  - Some: 23%
  - Most: 47%
  - All: 26%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%

Does the Community Feel That the Structure is Representative?

- **Female KL**
  - None: 0%
  - Some: 11%
  - Most: 44%
  - All: 19%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%

- **Male KL**
  - None: 2%
  - Some: 23%
  - Most: 47%
  - All: 26%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%

Does the Community Feel That the Structure is Useful?

- **Female KL**
  - None: 0%
  - Some: 13%
  - Most: 46%
  - All: 28%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%

- **Male KL**
  - None: 0%
  - Some: 25%
  - Most: 69%
  - All: 17%
  - Unable to Answer: 0%
Consistent with the findings of previous monitoring reports and as demonstrated in the above charts, there is an indication that male KIs are slightly more likely to find community structures legitimate, representative and useful than female KIs. This may be indicative of lack of representation of women in community structures and/or a need for community structures to focus great attention on the needs and concerns of women and girls in the community.

36% of KIs stated that the community structure does not receive any support. 35% stated that the structure receives material support, 16% stated that the structure receives financial support, and 13% stated that the structure receives capacity building support.

The above chart demonstrates the extent to which communities feel that the community structure is legitimate. The findings relating to the extent in which community structures are found to be representative and useful are similar to the above chart. It is noted that four KIs in Jebel Saman, one KI in Quamishli and two KIs in Idleb districts stated that no one in the community feels that the structure is legitimate. It is also noted that of two KIs in A’zaz district...
who responded to this question, one stated that some perceive the structure to be legitimate while one stated unable to answer.

2.6 Coping Mechanisms

The below charts indicate how often community members have relied in the recent period upon the following coping mechanisms: early marriage, dropping out of school to work, humanitarian assistance, illegal activities (such as theft or smuggling), restricting movement of women and girls, begging, accessing community services (community centers, women centers) and local/community support. While some coping mechanisms, such as early marriage and dropping out of school are harmful, causing individuals and communities harm by increasing their protection risks in the longer term, others are considered positive coping mechanisms, such as reliance on community services and community support.
**Harmful or Neutral Coping Mechanisms**

How often have community members relied on the following as a coping mechanism in the last three weeks?

1. Early Marriage
2. Children Dropping Out of School to Work
3. Humanitarian Assistance
4. Illegal Activities (such as theft or smuggling)
5. Restricting Movement of Women and Girls
6. Begging

**Positive Coping Mechanisms**

- Accessing Community Services (Community centers, Women Centers)
- Local/Community Support

Reliance upon humanitarian assistance is greater in districts which host a large number of IDPs, such as districts of Aleppo and Idleb governorates. An especially large percentage of KIs in Harim district stated that reliance upon humanitarian assistance is common, very common or always.

While the nature of the conflict and displacement forces many communities to rely on humanitarian assistance for survival, the humanitarian community recognizes that dependency on this assistance cannot be sustained indefinitely and that communities must also develop resiliency and sources of livelihood for the long term. Until the circumstances
make it feasible for communities to become self-sufficient, humanitarian assistance is vital for the survival and recuperation of these communities.

Projects that help generate livelihood and strengthen the self-sufficiency of communities are encouraged. These initiatives must however be implemented after careful assessment of community needs and capacities as well as market analysis. In many communities where conflict is ongoing or is newly slowing down, communities are concerned with meeting their essential, basic needs and are not yet prepared for longer-term sustainable livelihood projects that require factors such as security, resources such as land, and most importantly, time to meet their objectives. It is essential to communicate with communities prior to initiating these projects. Humanitarian actors are recommended to take the approach of assessing short-term and long-term needs of the community, and to work towards fulfilling short-term needs prior to initiating longer-term projects such as livelihood generation.

Communities in every monitored location indicated some reliance on the harmful coping mechanism of restricting movement of women and girls. More than half of KIs in the following locations stated that the community relies on this coping mechanism sometimes: Al Bab, A’zaz, Jebel Saman districts of Aleppo, Tell Abiad district of Ar-Raqqa, and Homs district of Homs governorate. Reliance on this coping mechanism can increase due to certain factors such as IDPs living in crowded, close quarters and reports of security incidents in the community. The coping mechanism, however, significantly reduces women and girls’ quality of life, restricts their access to services such as education, health care, employment and markets, and has a negative impact on their psychosocial experience.
The above chart visualizes the extent to which community members rely on community services, considered here as a positive coping mechanism. The findings indicate that communities do not or cannot access community services very often. This is true even in areas where there are a high number of IDPs and humanitarian actor presence, such as districts in Idleb governorate.

**Conclusion**

Communities of north and northwest Syria that protection monitors visited during the April-June 2018 reporting period continued to experience volatile and unpredictable security situations and displacement. Findings during this period indicate that communities continue to experience challenges in accessing basic needs and services, and face a variety of, and often inter-linked protection risks. The humanitarian community continues its efforts to provide life-saving assistance and protection services to these communities and has demonstrated great agility and practicality in supporting with emergency services, particularly in response to displacement. The detailed explanations and observations provided by key informants participating in protection monitoring indicates that communities require continued support and assistance for their survival, and also need the humanitarian community to increase receptivity to community needs and concerns, and help formulate solutions that are jointly-identified, effective and beneficial.

During this reporting period, findings indicate the following needs:

- More transparent and streamlined assistance distribution processes, ensuring that the in-need and most vulnerable members of the community continue to have access to humanitarian assistance;
- Proactive identification of IDP groups that are in need of support on civil status documentation;
- Improved access to medical services, especially the provision of specialized and advanced medical equipment and treatment, and the availability of 24-hour emergency medical service;
- PSS and child-friendly services in remote communities that have so far not been accessed; and
- Access to specialized services in communities, as well as referrals to existing services.

Humanitarian actors are encouraged to take these needs into consideration for future programming, and also consult with the Protection Cluster regularly about these challenges.
Online Interactive Dashboard

The PMTF Online Interactive Dashboard presents an overview and detailed analysis of protection monitoring findings from north and northwest Syria. It provides a user-friendly and practical approach for quick, location-based protection risk assessment, and makes it possible to follow trends and changes in the protection environment. As it is updated on a weekly basis, it provides a real-time understanding of the protection situation in these communities. Humanitarian actors are encouraged to utilize the dashboard for their analysis needs, and can analyze the findings available in this and future reports through the indicator-specific analysis, available on additional tabs. The interactive dashboard is available online at: [http://tiny.cc/jwnory](http://tiny.cc/jwnory)
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