

Housing, Land and Property (HLP) in 2016 Humanitarian Response Plans

The Housing, Land and Property Area of Responsibility under the Global Protection Cluster undertook a review of 18 Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP) for 2016 to identify the level of integration of housing, land and property (HLP) issues into planned humanitarian interventions. The analysis is part of an on-going review process, which will continue in 2017 with greater engagement of the field based HLP sub-clusters and working groups. The analysis is based on a desk review of the HRP documents and does not look at other parts of the process including the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), Strategic Response Plan (SRP), M&E Frameworks, Financial Tracking Service (FTS), Online Projects System (OPS), etc. However, as a first step, this review has been useful in providing the AoR with baseline information to support HLP sub-clusters/working groups to engage with the HRP process in the future.

The review found that overall a large number of protection responses refer explicitly to HLP or to aspects of HLP (access to land or housing) and many shelter and CCCM responses identify HLP as a specific issue to address. In addition, access and availability of land is also often mentioned in relation to food security, agriculture and/or livelihood responses. Finally, land is also linked to early recovery, durable solutions and mine action.

Overview per country:

HRP **Afghanistan**: No specific reference to HLP as such, but access to land mentioned under the food security and agriculture sector (p. 17) and families without property documentation identified as a group at risk under the protection sector (p. 20).

HPR **Burundi**: No specific reference to HLP as such, but severe damages to housing and agricultural land as a result of floods identified under vulnerability to natural hazards mentioned (p. 8).

HRP **CAR**: HLP explicitly mentioned under the protection section particularly relating to displacement and return (p. 32) and a specific HLP objective (objective 3) under Protection (p. 56). Mention of adequate housing under CCCM/Shelter (objective 5, p. 21).

HRP **Colombia**: No explicit reference to HLP but specific objective 3 of the section on early recovery explicitly refers to land restitution processes and conflict resolution (pp. 25, 26, 58 and 61); temporary housing mentioned under CCCM/Shelter (p. 19, 20, 38, 43 and 53).

HRP **Djibouti**: No specific reference to HLP as such, but mention that heat and arid conditions have left only 0,01% of the land arable (p. 4) and agriculture and livestock are key for food security (indicator under strategic objective 3, p. 25, and strategic indicator under food security objective 2, p. 26, and refugee response objective 2, p. 30).

HRP **DRC**: HLP explicitly mentioned under protection (p. 23) under criteria for prioritisation to include persons whose HLP rights were violated.



HRP **Guatemala** and **Honduras**: No specific reference to HLP as such but land mentioned in relation to livelihoods (p. 5). The HRP for Honduras specifically mentions the limited access to land for cultivation under the food security sector (p. 20) and specific objective 1 under food security explicitly refers to land management (p. 32).

HRP **Haiti**: No specific reference to HLP as such, but mention of housing and livelihoods for IDPs under supporting resilience and long terms solutions (p. 13 and 35). Land degradation and its impact on agriculture mentioned under natural disasters (p. 8) and also linked to food security.

HRP Iraq: HLP issues are explicitly mentioned under the protection second-line response as well as the full cluster response (pp. 32, 34 and 35); and under shelter in relation to the second-line shelter response (p. 53) and exit strategy and protection mainstreaming (p. 54). Land is also mentioned in connection to mine action activities (P. 35) and food security (p. 37) in relation to availability of land for families to be able to produce their own food.

HRP **Myanmar**: No specific reference to HLP as such, but mention of housing under CCCM and Shelter sector response (p. 25), land grabbing and occupation of places of origin mentioned as a protection concern in Kachin and Shan States (p. 9) and in relation to livelihoods and mine action in relation to land located in conflict areas (p. 8).

HRP **oPt**: HLP explicitly mentioned under the protection section (p. 20) as well as under the shelter section (p. 24) with a specific focus on assistance to widowed female head of households with insecure tenure.

HRP **Nigeria**: HLP issues mentioned in the response strategy (p. 8), lack of access to agricultural land highlighted as a protection concern (p. 13), the provision of land for the most vulnerable mentioned as a response under early recovery and livelihoods for returnee households (p. 24) and access to agricultural land linked to food security.

HRP **Somalia**: HLP mentioned under Strategic objective 3 (p. 10); under the protection sector, the need to strengthen prevention and response to HLP rights violations and improve access to effective mechanisms to restore HLP rights for IDPs and others is also mentioned (p. 33); HLP is also mentioned under the shelter sector (p. 35 and p. 55).

HRP South Sudan: HLP issues mentioned under the protection sector (p. 20).

HRP **Syria**: HLP issues identified as a sector gap for the protection sector (p. 22) calling for the need to have more partners working on this issue; HLP also mentioned in the shelter sector (p. 43) with the need to have information and counselling on HLP integrated into shelter interventions to mitigate the risks associated with insecure tenure and evictions.

HRP Ukraine: HLP specifically mentioned under protection (p. 21) and housing under shelter (p. 22).

HRP **Yemen**: HLP specifically mentioned under growing protection risks and rights violations (p. 8) under the overview of the crisis.

HRP **Zimbabwe:** No specific reference to HLP but land highlighted as imperative for planning and developing responses under protection as a cross-cutting issue (p. 10).



Conclusion:

Despite the varied degree of reference to HLP issues, it can be concluded from the review that HLP considerations were not fully integrated into the 2016 Humanitarian Response Plans. More work needs to be done, including better linkages with the Protection Cluster/Sector and its sub-clusters (in particular Mine Action and GBV), Shelter, CCCM, and Food Security and Livelihoods for example. Greater efforts may also need to be made by the HLP sub-clusters and working groups in the field to engage with OCHA and the Humanitarian Country Team to ensure that HLP issues are appropriately integrated in their operations.