



UNHCR
The UN
Refugee Agency

IDPs in Host Families and Host Communities: Assistance for hosting arrangements

Anne Davies

Division of International Protection
Protection Operational Support
April 2012



UNHCR

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés

Division of International Protection

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

CP2500, 1211 Geneva 2

Switzerland

www.unhcr.org

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the position of the United Nations or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This paper may be freely quoted, cited and copied for academic, educational or other non-commercial purposes without prior permission from UNHCR, provided that the source and author are acknowledged.

The author is grateful to the following people who made time for interviews to share their experiences of hosting activities in various field settings: Prof. Walter Kaelin, Marcel Stroessel, Steven Michel, Aude Rigot, Ellie Kamp, Helmut Scheuer, Jean-Yves Barcelo, Nina Birkeland, Katrine Wold, Steven Muncy, Josep Zapater, William Chemaly, Gonzalo Vargas, Rosalie Fournier, Vincent Briard, Nyanjagi Ally, Juliette Murekeyisoni, Berhane Taklu-Nagga, Karl Steinacker, Nasser Fernandes, Kamel Deriche.

© Anne Davies 2012.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction	7
2.1 Background.....	7
2.2. Purpose and Scope	8
3. Operational Experiences	10
3.1. Why assist IDPs in host families and host communities?.....	10
3.2 Overview of country case studies.....	12
3.3 Assistance methods and models.....	13
3.3.1. Assistance to Host Communities.....	14
3.3.2. Assistance to individual families - cash-based assistance.....	15
3.3.3. Assistance to individual families - non-cash based assistance.....	16
3.3.4. Combining Assistance to Host Communities and Families	17
3.3.5. Where intervention may not be appropriate.....	17
4. Lessons Learned.....	18
4.1. Important factors to consider.....	18
4.2. Other Lessons Learned from the Case Studies.....	24
5. Steps towards an assistance framework	27
6. Conclusions	29
7. Recommendations.....	30
Annexes.....	31
Annex A: Acronyms.....	31
Annex B: Glossary.....	32
Annex C: Detailed Case Studies.....	33
a) Examples of Assistance to Host Communities	33
b) Combination of Assistance to Host Families and Host Communities	35
c) Assistance to Individual Families	41
d) Examples of other issues of importance.....	48
ANNEX D: Manuals and guidance materials.....	50
ANNEX E: Sample verification form	52
ANNEX F: Assistance to idps in Host Families and Host Communities: Checklist, Modalities and Advice for Unstable Situations	53

1. Executive Summary

The phenomenon of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees residing with host families is still relatively unexplored in comparison to what is known about IDPs and refugees living in camps. Of the nearly 14.7 million IDPs protected and assisted by UNHCR in 2010, an estimated 52% of the total live outside formal camps in both rural and urban areas. At least half of the 54 countries monitored by IDMC have few or no camps for IDPs. Alternative coping mechanisms, including living with host families in host communities, are the norm for a majority of IDPs. It is often assumed that IDPs in hosting arrangements are located mainly in urban areas and are likely to be more affluent than IDPs in camps - and consequently less vulnerable or in need of assistance. This view is being challenged by studies showing the extent of hosting in rural areas and the growing prevalence of host families and host communities suffering economic strains from sharing already meagre resources with IDPs.

Humanitarian actors are increasingly advocating for greater assistance to IDPs living outside camps and with host families and/or in host communities.¹ This stems in part from the recognition that, if more IDPs live outside camps than within them and only IDPs in camps receive assistance, then over half the global IDP population is being missed (while also recognizing that not all IDPs outside camps need assistance). A related consideration is the human rights concept of providing assistance to displaced populations without discrimination owing to their ethnic background, reasons for displacement or where they might be living: the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement state that 'every IDP has the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his or her residence' and should therefore receive equal treatment wherever they choose to live.²

This study examines cases where UNHCR and other humanitarian actors have implemented programmes to support hosting, both in individual families and host communities, with a view to sharing experiences and learning for future programmes. Examples of assistance methods examined in this study cover different displacement contexts and phases, and fall into three main categories:

- Assistance to IDPs in host families/and their hosts: cash-based and non-cash-based;
- Assistance to host communities: community infrastructure and/or services; support to information or social development centres; Quick Impact Projects (QIPs); and
- A combination of assistance to individual families and host communities (the most prevalent model).

Overall, the study shows that it is possible to support hosting situations but that doing so may be more complex and time-consuming than assisting IDPs in camps. It is important to recognize that in some cases, camps may provide greater protection from violence and abuse. The aim should be to respect how IDPs choose to cope with their displacement and to support their choices where possible.

¹ See for example: *Internally Displaced Persons Outside Camps: Achieving a More Equitable Humanitarian Response*, paper prepared by UNHCR and the Representative of the Secretary General for the Human Rights of IDPs for Inter-Agency Standing Committee, 77th Working Group Meeting, 7-9 July 2010; *Out of Site: Building better responses to displacement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by helping host families*, Katherine Haver, Oxfam GB, DRC, 2008; and *Internal Displacement in North Kivu: Hosting, Camps and Coping Mechanisms*, study prepared for UNICEF and CARE DRC, Steve McDowell, 2009.

² Guiding Principle 14, <http://www.idpguidingprinciples.org/>

Most of the examples point to the need to support host communities as well as individual families, both to alleviate the pressure on community resources and to prevent or reduce the tensions inherent in sharing them. In many cases an assistance programme started off with the intention of supporting individual families and was later revised when the needs of the wider host community – and the dividends that could result from assisting it – became clear.

Unfortunately, the benefits of reducing vulnerability by assisting IDPs and their hosts *before* they fall into extreme poverty and deprivation have not yet filtered through to donors. A recent example in Haiti shows that, had resources been available to provide seeds to IDPs outside camps in a rural setting, they could have grown their own food. Instead, they had to rely on their hosts to provide them with food - undermining their self-esteem and depleting their hosts' resources.

For humanitarian actors seeking to effectively support hosting mechanisms – whether through direct support to individuals, host families, or host communities – this study concludes that the following factors are essential for consideration:

Context: Each hosting context is different and support needs to be tailored to the context. There is no 'one size fits all' template that can be fitted to a hosting assistance programme. Whatever the context, however, protecting people and safeguarding their human rights must be the basic rationale of any programme.

Assessments: Each situation needs to be assessed and analyzed separately to identify context-specific characteristics. Assessments should be multi-sectoral in nature to capture all aspects of IDPs' and their hosts' conditions, to explore the full range of opportunities and risks of intervention and to ensure an appropriate intervention. Without a proper assessment an intervention could create greater tensions between and within communities, leading to heightened protection issues. A key consideration should be: what resource transfer approach in a given context would be most effective to address assessed needs, while being acceptable to the target population? Assessments may reveal that families or host communities are coping well without assistance and, in such cases, care must be taken not to distort natural coping mechanisms.

Timing: There exists a paradox between the considerable time needed to carry out an in-depth and multi-sectoral assessment and the time pressure to assist the displaced and their hosts before the former feel they are obliged to move again. Practitioners need to balance the speed needed to make meaningful contributions before the situation changes with the need to understand the situation comprehensively before addressing it responsibly.

Proximity to areas of origin: The closer to home areas that IDPs are assisted, the easier their decision may be to return when conditions are conducive, or to visit their homes periodically to protect property, cultivate their fields and maintain links (pendulum displacement).

Community participation: Assistance to hosting arrangements is most successful when designed with community participation. Assistance to individual families – whether IDPs, their hosts or other vulnerable families – should be sanctioned by the community to avoid creating tensions. Community participation in assessments, setting vulnerability criteria, programme design, monitoring and decision-making are key to avoiding such tensions, as are clear communications to the community regarding the aims and modalities of the programme. Communities are likely to be more receptive to hosting if some of their needs are addressed concurrently.

Commonly-agreed, context-specific vulnerability criteria: Vulnerability criteria, whether applicable to communities or individual families, should be commonly agreed by all humanitarian actors in an intervention area. This should avoid inter-community tensions where different standards are applied. Vulnerability criteria should be designed with particular regard to each specific setting and context, as what might be appropriate for one context may not be for another. For example, in some contexts the most vulnerable may be displaced landless rural families whereas they might be urban slum-dwellers in a different context. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement specify that ‘children, including unaccompanied minors, expectant mothers, mothers with young children, female heads of household, persons with disabilities and elderly persons’ have the ‘entitlement of protection and assistance required by their condition and to treatment which takes into account their special needs’.³

Targeting: When resources are particularly scarce, it may only be possible to assist people with specific needs (PSNs) – whether or not they are IDPs or host families - and this must be communicated to the community. It may prove very challenging to identify these among the chronically poor. Communities should be the ones to perform the filter in most cases, to encourage buy-in and reduce the risk of tensions.

Verification: Where communities or local authorities perform beneficiary selection, adequate verification mechanisms must be put in place and the list revised or rejected if unjustifiable bias is detected.

Monitoring: Whatever the assistance programme implemented, close monitoring is necessary during each phase to ensure that protection and programme objectives are being met, to detect and redress possible abuse of resources, and to make adjustments where necessary. Since IDPs outside camps are usually more dispersed, monitoring may require greater resources in terms of time and logistics. ‘Remote monitoring’ through community mechanisms may be necessary in areas that are too insecure or distant for international teams.

The study concludes that greater focus and energy on assisting IDPs outside camps in hosting arrangements⁴ is both necessary and possible to save and protect lives and livelihoods. The examples and lessons presented in this report⁵ are designed to boost the confidence of humanitarian actors and lead them to pilot and further develop assistance initiatives to IDPs outside camps. Gradually, as knowledge and experience grow, a systematic hosting assistance framework could be developed.

³ Guiding Principle 4.2

⁴ Although this study covers IDPs, its conclusions may also be applied to many refugee situations. In 2011 UNHCR designed a dual assistance programme that encompassed Libyans fleeing the conflict to Tunisia where the majority were hosted by Tunisian families, and their hosts.

⁵ A number of agency guidelines and manuals, providing details of different assistance mechanisms to IDPs in hosting situations, are listed in Annexes to this document and referred to in specific sections.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background

The humanitarian community is increasingly coming to recognize that displaced populations – whether refugees or IDPs – often prefer, or have little other option, to reside with host families rather than in organized camps. There may be important protection dividends for IDPs residing outside camps and this can be a very positive coping strategy. Decisions by IDPs to reside with host families may be due to a number of factors, such as:

- The absence of camps in many situations of internal displacement;
- The opportunity to pursue local integration;
- The perception of many IDPs that greater opportunities exist to ‘go it alone’ outside camps and by migrating to towns and cities for work – with corresponding opportunities to support family members located elsewhere through remittances;
- Protection problems for certain IDPs within camps which lead them to seek greater security outside a camp;
- The simple opportunity of having relatives or friends and other social networks where hosting is possible; or
- A combination of some or all of the above factors leading some families to split their options, whereby part of the family may reside in a camp while one or several family members migrate to areas where work opportunities are greater, and where they may have host-enabling networks.

Few strategies exist in the collective humanitarian toolbox to assist host families or host communities. The practice of how best to support to host families or communities has not been catalogued or considered in a systematic manner. A large proportion of internally displaced populations, in nearly all countries where internal displacement exists, may remain outside the ambit of international protection and assistance. However, it should not be assumed that assistance is required or desirable in all cases. Where it is not needed, or where families are coping well without assistance, care must be taken not to distort natural coping mechanisms.

Because of the relative invisibility of IDPs residing with host families and in host communities and the lack of a systematic attempt to survey them, the scope of the phenomenon is unknown and numbers/profiles can only be vague estimates.

Reports from different sources show that most IDPs and their hosts face a fragile existence of poverty and insecurity. Hosting IDPs can exacerbate the impoverishment of the host family and cause different forms of exploitation within and between the hosted and the hosts.⁶ Host communities may suffer from having to share inadequate resources with sudden influxes of IDPs or from gradual depletion of resources over time. IDPs may come to be seen as unwelcome and be targeted for discrimination – or worse. For all these reasons it is becoming urgent to learn more about IDPs living with host families and to devise systematic tools and approaches to protect and assist them, where necessary.

⁶ *Out of Site* – op.cit.

2.2. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this study is to enable a better understanding of the phenomenon of IDPs living in host families/communities, based on a review of select experiences to date. Humanitarian actors will be able to use these experiences as a reference for formulating their own assistance policies and programmes.

The report:

- provides an overview and concrete illustrations of the situation of IDPs living with host families/communities in various contexts and identifies the needs of both IDPs and their hosts and the potential impacts, both positive and negative, of such arrangements;
- documents efforts undertaken by international actors thus far to better understand the phenomenon (numbers, locations and circumstances) of IDP populations living with host families and in host communities;
- examines cases where humanitarian actors have provided support to IDPs in host families, to the families themselves, and to host communities. This includes examples of how recipients were targeted and reached, the rationale for providing different kinds of assistance in each case and constraints encountered;
- draws lessons learned from experience to date and makes recommendations on the conditions/contexts in which the international community may usefully support host families/communities, along with the types of support that might be considered; and
- recommends a framework for future hosting assistance programmes.

The study covers a range of hosting assistance examples. It includes those that were successful – examples of ‘good practice’ – as well as ‘missed opportunity cases’ where assistance was not forthcoming despite evidence-based needs and opportunities, and cases where hosting was found to be inappropriate or did not work out as planned.

In several examples, the assistance programme was not specifically targeted at displacement-affected households, but it became clear from assessments or beneficiary registration that many of the beneficiaries turned out to be IDPs in host families or were host families themselves. In the interests of looking at as comprehensive an array of hosting arrangements as possible – that is, where hosting is either targeted, or emerges as a phenomenon within an assistance programme – both examples are covered in the study.

Another point to clarify involves terminology. The term: ‘IDPs in Host Families’ creates an image of nuclear IDP families hosted by nuclear host families, *i.e.* distinct family units inside four-walled housing units. The reality is more blurred. ‘IDPs in Host Families’ can in fact refer to host families and host communities, the hosts and the hosted, in rental or guest arrangements, in four-walled brick housing or makeshift shelters – and anything in between. The shorthand terminology found to be most useful is ‘hosting situations’ or ‘hosting arrangements’, with corresponding descriptions of the breakdown in each particular context.

It should be noted that no studies have been done which explicitly compare the vulnerabilities of host families with those of non-host families. Nor have any studies looked at the same group of families before and after hosting. It is therefore not possible to provide hard evidence, apart from a sample of post-intervention evaluations, that assistance to hosting has the desired effect of pro-

protecting people better by improving their living conditions. On the other hand, in UNHCR's recent experience in Tunisia – where a majority of Libyan refugees were hosted by Tunisian families of similar ethnic backgrounds – UNHCR-provided assistance to both hosts and hosted meant that the Libyans were able to remain sheltered in those families and protected according to their own preferences. The delays in getting this assistance programme off the ground resulted in some families moving to camps because they felt they were becoming too much of a burden on their hosts. They did not wish to move, and did not feel they were better protected or assisted in the camps.

3. Operational Experiences

This section examines the reasons for assisting IDPs in hosting situations and provides examples of assistance programmes from recent field experiences. A chart summarizes the experiences examined per location, showing the rationale for the interventions and the nature of the assistance programmes.

3.1. Why assist IDPs in host families and host communities?

The hosting experiences examined for this study illustrate the following rationales for supporting hosting arrangements.

Non-discrimination

The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement stipulate that “ every internally displaced person has the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his or her residence” (Principle 14) and that “internally displaced persons, whether or not they are living in camps, shall not be discriminated against as a result of their displacement” (Principle 22). IDPs choosing to live in host families have the same rights to protection and assistance as those in camps, yet it is predominantly in camps where they receive the best – if not the only – such treatment.

IDP preferences:

IDPs usually prefer living with host families – a situation seen as ‘physically, emotionally and spiritually’ more secure. Providing assistance mainly through camps can undermine traditional coping mechanisms and limit the choices available to IDPs. People should be able to go where they feel safest and assistance should be provided in ways that support livelihoods and help to keep families together.

Enhancing positive coping strategies

IDPs in host families and communities usually find greater opportunities for work, business, food production, education and socialization, among other advantages, than those confined to camps. Idleness, dependency or an inability to adequately maintain one’s family undermines self-esteem. Income-generation or work opportunities in host communities can contribute to self-sufficiency and raise self-esteem.

⁷ *Out of Site*: op.cit.

Proximity to areas of origin

The closer to their home areas that IDPs are assisted, the easier their decision may be to return when conditions are conducive, or to visit their home areas periodically to protect property, cultivate fields and maintain home community links. It may be difficult for IDPs to judge when is the right moment to return if their displacement is far from home and from their former means of livelihood. This usually influences their own preference to stay in host families or host communities close to their home areas, rather than go to formal camps further afield.

IDPs hosting IDPs

In urban areas such as Nairobi, Bogota and Goma, the majority of IDPs are hosted by families who are former IDPs themselves. Given their already precarious situations, hosting can rapidly deplete their meagre resources and propel them from chronic to extreme poverty. Multiplied several thousand times in tightly-packed neighbourhoods, the general deterioration in hygiene and sanitation conditions could lead to outbreaks of communicable diseases with the potential to infect wealthier neighbourhoods. Many agencies in Kenya believe Nairobi slum areas to be perilously close to such a humanitarian disaster, which if it occurred would be of massive proportions.⁸

Host families – the ‘silent NGO’

Hosted IDPs survive by sharing food and resources with the host and taking advantage of income-generating opportunities that exist in the host community. This positions host families and communities as an informal instrument of humanitarian aid - *de facto* NGOs critical to saving lives, building resilience and providing essential services. A study of IDP hosting in North Kivu, DRC, calculated that costs to individual host families amounted to over half of their income.⁹ The resources of host communities, often poor themselves, can become over-stretched through hosting. Vulnerability is accentuated in communities already stressed through over-stretched WASH resources and diminished food stocks. Boosting support to host families and host communities through appropriate and targeted programmes can share the burden of hosting by enhancing their resilience, reducing possible tensions and helping IDPs to survive. On the other hand, it is important to recognize when hosting may distort IDPs’ and their hosts’ coping mechanisms and consider ways to avoid this.

The Final Strategy for Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas notes the importance of communities and host families for protecting lives in complex emergency and disaster contexts. It recommends that ‘a more systematic assessment and approach to supporting host families as partners in humanitarian responses is a high priority for IASC agencies and other humanitarian actors’.¹⁰

⁸ Interviews with Oxfam, Care, Concern, Kenya

⁹ *Internal Displacement in North Kivu*: op.cit.

¹⁰ *Final Strategy for Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas* – IASC Working Group, November 2010

3.2 Overview of country case studies

Seventeen hosting experiences in eleven countries were researched and documented for this study. While attempting to look into as many cases as possible, others have almost certainly been overlooked. However, those documented do provide an overview of support initiatives to hosting in recent times and represent a good cross-section of different contexts, along with useful lessons learned.

Location	Year	Situation	Implementing Agency	Programme	Rationale
Colombia	Ongoing	Conflict	Casas de Todo	Assistance to vulnerable individuals in IDP host communities	To provide protection services to vulnerable people in communities of high displacement
Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), N. Kivu	2009	Conflict	UNICEF, Care, Oxfam	Host community infrastructure; individual IDPs in host families, host families and vulnerable people	To support host families and communities absorb new arrivals, alleviate stress on resources and assist local integration.
Haiti/ Dominican Republic	2010	Natural disaster	UNHCR	Individual assistance to EVIs, including IDPs in host families, QIPs for host communities	To alleviate the burden of IDPs in host families and host communities
Indonesia, Aceh	2005	Natural disaster	Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)	Cash assistance to IDP host families	To support traditional hosting mechanisms
Kenya, Rift Valley	2008	Post-election violence	UNHCR, ACF	Individual assistance to IDPs in host communities	To assist the community absorb IDPs and promote peace-building and reconciliation between ethnic groups engaged in violence
Lebanon	2006 - 2007	Conflict	UNHCR	Individual assistance to IDPs in host communities; Host community infrastructure and QIPs	To assist the community absorb IDPs in a post conflict recovery context
Philippines	2009	Disaster and conflict	UNHCR/CFSI	Individual assistance to IDPs in host communities; QIPs	To assist EVIs in host families (Metro-Manila) and host communities (Northern Luzon)
Serbia	1999 - 2001	Conflict	SDC	Assistance to host families; host community infrastructure	To assist the community absorb IDPs/refugees in a post-conflict recovery context
Somalia		Conflict and disaster	UNHCR	Individual assistance to IDPs in host communities; host community infrastructure and services	To provide shelter extension for host families, assist the most vulnerable families in the community, assist the community absorb IDPs and returnees, and expand protection networks and monitoring
Sri Lanka	2005	Natural disaster	Helvetas	Cash assistance to IDPs in host families	To support traditional hosting mechanisms
Yemen	2009 - 2010	Conflict	UNHCR	Assistance to host communities close to IDP camps	To alleviate the burden of host communities

3.3 Assistance methods and models

This section looks at the different kinds of assistance delivery mechanisms used for IDPs and their hosts, covering different displacement situations and phases.

Assistance delivery mechanisms fall broadly into three categories:

- Assistance to host communities;
- Assistance to individual IDP and host families;
- Combination of assistance to host communities and to vulnerable families within these communities, many of whom are IDPs or hosts.

The 'combination' model appears to be the most widely-used. Even in cases where the initial aim was to assist individual IDP families and their hosts, assessments often revealed that whole communities were suffering from over-crowding and depletion of community resources from their hosting activities. Agencies were obliged to revise their initial plans by finding ways to assist the host community, as well as individual families, to avoid creating or exacerbating tensions. In all but a few of the cases, agencies found it inappropriate to target assistance according to any kind of individual 'status', and designed their programmes to target the most vulnerable families in a community, irrespective of the hosting aspect. The fact that many of those assessed as highly vulnerable turned out to be host families supports a view that hosting can increase vulnerability.

The following are brief examples of assistance models that have been used in specific situations. They show the rationale for selecting the particular model and how the programme was implemented. A wider sample with more details is provided in Annex A.

3.3.1. Assistance to Host Communities

The rationale for assisting displacement-affected host communities is to strengthen their absorption capacity and resilience when faced with large numbers of IDPs. A corollary objective is to reduce tensions between host community members and IDPs where already-scarce resources are further stretched by the newcomers.

Two key methods for assisting host communities are:

1

Assistance in the form of host community infrastructure improvement through technical support. Examples include improving water and sanitation resources, schools and health services or implementing quick impact projects (QIPs) designed by the community according to their own priorities. In all cases examined, community members were employed in cash-for-work and other income-generation schemes, boosting the community's economy.

EXAMPLE 1 - HOST COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT

Context: In Serbia, in the aftermath of the Bosnia and Kosovo wars of the 1990s, the Swiss Agency for Cooperation and Development (SDC) assisted host families and municipalities over-stretched with influxes of people from Bosnia, Croatia and Kosovo. In some communities IDPs represented 25% of the population and municipalities received no assistance from the national government. SDC community support included heating systems repairs and provision of school equipment.

Methodology: Municipalities – and some civil society institutions – drew up plans and budgets for priority interventions of their choice and signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with SDC, which underwrote the projects.

Results: Reduction of tensions in the communities through the alleviation of services, greater school attendance of IDP children and the build-up of trust between the municipalities, community members and international donors. The programme proved to be cost-effective with the direct implementation of SDC rather than working through secondary partners.

2

Assistance in the form of expanding existing or establishing new community 'drop-in' centres to provide needed services that are accessible to everyone in the community, including IDPs. This method was found useful in assisting urban refugees.

EXAMPLE 1 - SUPPORT TO HOST COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTRE

Context: In Somalia, protracted conflict and natural disasters (flooding and drought) have displaced many people from the South/Central regions to the safer and more stable region of Somaliland. The Protection Cluster in Somaliland is very active in terms of identifying and addressing host community concerns regarding IDPs and returnees.¹¹ Community assistance interventions have been initiated through the cluster in several host communities with crowding and infrastructure challenges.

Methodology:

- A Legal Clinic was established to offer free legal help to all those in the community, including IDPs and returnees. This is implemented through the University of Hargeisa.
- An SGBV and Disability Prevention and Response Programme is implemented through various local NGOs. UNICEF, with funds raised by UNHCR, trains NGO case workers and builds their capacity to address child SGBV. These operate as Community Outreach Volunteers, detecting SGBV problems in communities and raising awareness. In most cases, problems can be resolved through face-saving reconciliation measures and dialogue. Severe criminal cases are referred to the Legal Clinic where perpetrators may be taken to court. Assistance includes the establishment in communities of 'safe houses' for battered women, providing them with clothing and medical care and offering counselling.

Results: These initiatives were found to promote peace and reconciliation between and within communities, both hosts and IDPs/returnees, proving that significant assistance can be provided through 'knowledge-based' services rather than material goods. Interventions can raise human rights and rule of law awareness while reducing tensions through the interaction of different clans and religions, obliged to live side by side in crowded spaces.

¹¹ 'Returnees' in the Somaliland context usually refers to Somali refugees who have repatriated to Somalia but have preferred to move to the greater security and employment possibilities of Somaliland. Few are from Somaliland itself but have used Somaliland or Puntland as departure points to seek asylum in neighbouring countries.

3.3.2. Assistance to individual families - cash-based assistance

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) has been experimenting with cash-based interventions for IDPs in host families for over a decade in Albania, Georgia, Indonesia, Ingushetia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Serbia, and others.¹² The types of projects funded by SDC reflect its desire to support projects that other agencies are not doing, or cannot do.

EXAMPLE 1 - CASH ASSISTANCE TO IDPS IN HOST FAMILIES

Context: After the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami disaster, SDC decided to assist IDPs in host families in **Aceh, Indonesia**. The aim of the project was to prevent further displacement of the estimated 60-80% tsunami victims staying in host families to temporary / semi-permanent IDP camps ('baraks') and to support traditional hosting mechanisms.

Methodology: Assistance was cash-based and entailed what is now an institutionalized process in SDC¹³. Steps involved: assessment, signature of an MOU with the local authorities, beneficiary selection from local authorities based on the location of hosted IDPs, verification of 10% of targeted beneficiaries in each community¹⁴, registration of IDPs in host families, arrangement of banking formalities and the opening of individual accounts for beneficiaries, distribution of a one-time grant of US\$ 100 per IDP family in a host family through bank transfer, performed over a period of three months, monitoring and evaluation. A carefully designed public relations strategy communicated the aims and details of the programme to communities through messages posted at district and community offices at each step of the operation, promoting community acceptance.

Results:¹⁵ The programme was effective in reaching all targeted beneficiaries as well as in having a multiplier effect (economic impact on the community) and sustainable impact (improved livelihoods of beneficiaries). Abuse of cash was not an issue. Empowerment and choice to recipients supported individual coping strategies. Cash assistance did not create noticeable inflation and did not lead to food shortages. On the contrary, it boosted local markets and the local economy. SDC underlines the importance of undertaking a market survey prior to cash interventions and subsequent regular monitoring of the development of prices for basic food items. In isolated areas, greater availability of cash can stress supplies and cause inflation.

Drawbacks: Intensive assessments and registration were time-consuming and delayed the project, with the result that some of the IDPs may have exhausted their hosts' resources and felt compelled to move to an IDP centre before receiving their benefits. The agency believes that there is no way to short-cut these steps. Repeated communications can provide reassurance of coming assistance.

In emergency situations it may be too time-consuming to filter host families according to their level of income or vulnerability. SDC recommends that, in the interests of timely intervention, it is necessary to opt for either a particular hosting pattern or for vulnerability. If both are mixed, there are too many variables to allow for timeliness and coherent public communications on the programme's intentions. Public awareness is the only efficient way to create openness from the hosting community, encourage participation from the local authorities and reduce fraud.

¹² For details of individual projects, see:

http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/Experiences/SDC_Cash_Transfer_Projects

¹³ SDC provides guidance, with examples, on each step of a cash transfer project in its Cash Workbook Toolbox:

http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/SDC_Cash_Workbook/Toolbox_Cash_Workbook

¹⁴ SDC took a random sample of 10% of the selected beneficiaries and conducted spot checks to verify that they were indeed IDPs residing with host families. In only a very few cases the verification exercise found that the documented host family had never hosted IDPs.

¹⁵ Experiences with Cash-based approaches at Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation:

www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/document.php?itemID=1779...1

3.3.3. Assistance to individual families - non-cash based assistance

EXAMPLE – ASSISTANCE TO IDPS IN DISPLACEMENT AND RETURN CONTEXTS

Context: In the post-election violence emergency context in **Kenya**, UNHCR estimated that some 70% of IDPs were outside camps and determined that, on the basis of non-discrimination, those outside camps as well as those in camps and informal settlements should be assisted. When return took place, IDPs could not always return to their homes, either because they felt insecure in communities which had turned against them during the violence or because their houses had been badly damaged or destroyed. They self-settled in small groups near their communities. Other returnee families were hosted by community members, most of whom lived in extremely poor conditions.

Methodology: Targeting entailed ‘self-selection’ by potential beneficiaries. IDPs or host family members came to IDP camps, or phoned the UNHCR office, and asked UNHCR to look into their situation. Staff immediately visited their homes and, through mere verification of the state of the houses – which in most cases were badly damaged yet still hosting displaced families – made an on-the-spot registration of the families and provided NFI assistance (domestic items and plastic sheeting for shelter), which they had stocked in their vehicles.

Returnees in self-settled groups also alerted UNHCR to their situation. Staff travelled to the site, performed an on-the-spot assessment and registration, and distributed plastic sheeting and food. While return assistance had been provided to all returning families, UNHCR distributed additional NFIs and shelter materials to host families, alleviating to a certain extent the depletion of their resources as a result of hosting. Assistance was a minimal, one-time emergency distribution with no linkage to longer-term recovery assistance.

Results: The *ad hoc* method of self-selection, on-the-spot verification, registration and assistance was a pragmatic choice in this case: IDPs and violence-affected families, many of whom were hosting others, were scattered over long distances and UNHCR only had small teams. It proved to be an efficient rapid response mechanism that provided assistance to people who needed it in the fastest possible manner, although self-selection alone raises questions about exclusion of individuals (elderly, persons with disabilities) who may not have been able to ask for assistance. Feedback from NGOs working in the return sites indicated that the assistance had also helped some of the aggressors. This proved to be a useful reconciliation tool, as an absence of discrimination between those in need helped to reduce tension in the communities.

EXAMPLE – ASSISTANCE TO IDPS AND THEIR HOST FAMILIES – URBAN DISPLACEMENT¹⁶

Context: With successive waves of conflict-induced displacement in **DRC**, many IDPs remained close to their home areas in hopes of a quick return when conditions allowed. Some, however, gravitated further afield to cities in search of greater employment opportunities and where they had family networks. In 2009, CARE International implemented pilot ‘Project Umoja’ to assist specifically-targeted IDPs and host families in Goma.

Methodology: Guided by the local authorities, the project selected two *quartiers* in Goma with high hosting occurrence and a high percentage of IDPs from areas where fast return seemed unlikely. CARE designed a pilot proposal for support to ‘solidarity families’ consisting of the host and one or more displaced family units, with a strong shelter component. A participatory process was held involving focus group discussions and a joint workshop with IDP and host families and the local authorities. This resulted in eligibility criteria to determine vulnerability, including pregnant or lactating women, single heads of household, child headed households, non-accompanied children under 5 years, chronic illness, elderly, physical or mental disability, unemployed head of household, family size, condition of the host family house and sanitation conditions. CARE verified all potential beneficiaries listed by the community to ensure maximum fairness. Assistance was in the form of vouchers with a value of US\$100 for each family (host and displaced), NFIs valued at \$80, issued in three instalments, and construction packages for an average value of \$365, issued to the host families for home extensions. Latrine construction in host family compounds was added where needed. IDPs were guaranteed freedom of rent for the constructed dwellings.

Results: An evaluation of the ‘Umoja’ project found that it assisted the most vulnerable in a transparent and accountable way. Beneficiaries appreciated the expansion of living space, affording greater dignity to both families. The voucher system was appreciated because it gave beneficiaries choice - used mainly on food and domestic items. The good quality urban housing mitigated the impact of an urban slum and the project was cost effective at US\$175 per capita. It facilitated the IDPs’ integration into the urban community and interaction with the local authorities was excellent.

¹⁶ This section is drawn from an external evaluation of the CARE project: *Evaluation Project Umoja*, Jeene, commissioned by Care International, Goma, 2009.

3.3.4. Combining Assistance to Host Communities and Families

This approach is based on the recognition that it is not only host families who risk impoverishment as the primary aid responders to IDPs; host communities also suffer from depleted or over-stretched resources from hosting them, especially when displacement is protracted.

EXAMPLE – ASSISTANCE TO IDPS AND HOST COMMUNITIES IN PROXIMITY TO CAMPS

Context: In **Yemen**, while there are currently three IDP camps in Hajjah Governorate, the majority of IDPs have settled outside the camps in scattered settlements around Haradh and Mazrak towns. This is because hosting is considered a sacred duty in Yemen and only marginalized people with no family or clan ties would consider going to camps. Noting that assistance to IDPs in the camps alone would prove discriminatory to the estimated 90% outside them, agencies have coordinated to support IDPs and host communities in a context of extreme poverty and deprivation, where between 5 and 10% of the population are classified as extremely vulnerable.

Methodology: UNHCR implemented a combined programme of (i) assistance to 12,000 IDPs, host families and other vulnerable families in the host communities, (ii) community-based assistance through Quick Impact Projects (QIPs), and (iii) assistance to IDPs in camps. In addition to targeting all host families as beneficiaries, other vulnerable families were identified by the communities and became beneficiaries of the project. Vulnerability criteria included family size, income and home conditions. Community lists were verified by UNHCR and beneficiaries registered. UNHCR has distributed NFIs – plastic sheeting and jerry cans; WFP distributes food; UNICEF is involved with improvements to water and sanitation in the communities, in addition to schools in the camps; MSF built a hospital in Haradh town from which mobile clinics visited host communities in an approximately 20 km radius; and water trucks deployed by Oxfam from the camps provide water to the local population.

Results: The high participation and involvement of the communities in targeting the most vulnerable families and in the selection of QIPs promoted greater harmony in the host communities and mitigated tensions over resource-sharing. UNHCR estimated that 50 to 60% of IDPs outside the camps are being reached through this programme.

3.3.5. Where intervention may not be appropriate

In the southern **Philippines provinces of Mindanao and Maguindanao**, hosting and clan/community self-help is so strongly engrained in the culture that clans considered it dishonourable to accept help from outside. International actors are aware of the high numbers of families in hosting situations but have decided not to assist them in order to avoid community perceptions of disempowerment, and possible backlash.

In **Albania** and **Macedonia**, the SDC piloted, in 1999 and 2000, two cash-based projects targeting 1,200 families hosting refugees from Kosovo in Albania and 3,500 families hosting IDPs from Kosovo in Macedonia. However, before the project could start, the hosted refugees and IDPs returned to Kosovo leaving SDC to make retroactive payments to the host families. This experience highlights the importance of timeliness.

Peer review of a Helvetas cash-for-host-family project in post-tsunami **Sri Lanka** considered that, while the Helvetas intervention was successful immediately after the disaster, it would not be appropriate to replicate such programmes six months later. Given the country's strong tradition of family ties and family self-help, projects using the Helvetas model risked damaging this culture by creating dependency and raising future expectations. Many other tsunami-affected families had been living with their relatives without any assistance and the government in particular preferred assistance to IDPs in the form of livelihoods projects. Agencies agreed to contribute through housing reconstruction and targeted livelihoods support to IDPs.

4. Lessons Learned

4.1. Important factors to consider

What emerges from the case studies is a consistent set of issues that need to be considered in planning and implementing assistance programmes to support hosting. These are not specific to hosting situations but may be useful as a checklist to ensure that all important issues have been taken into account:

- **Context**
- **Multi-sectoral assessments**
- **Timing**
- **Community participation**
- **Intervention options**
- **Beneficiary selection criteria**
- **Targeting**
- **Verification of beneficiaries**
- **Monitoring**
- **Contact with beneficiaries**
- **Transparency and accountability**
- **Cash options and modalities (where appropriate).**

Every context is different.

While there is no ‘one size fits all’ template that can be applied to all hosting assistance programmes, it is possible to draw lessons from certain programmes and activities and adapt them to new situations where the context may be similar. Whatever the context, protecting people and safeguarding their human rights must be the basic rationale of any assistance programme. Contextual factors include: the reason(s) for displacement, why IDPs are in hosting arrangements, cultural norms, ethnicity and demographics, the national and local security environment and legal frameworks, civil society strength and capacity, availability of suitable partners and interventions of other actors, including national and local governments. Contexts vary considerably from country to country, but also within the same country.

It is important to note that the extent of UNHCR’s involvement in urban areas is specific to each situation and depends on the needs and capacities of communities of concern, on the national and local legal frameworks, and other actors.

UNHCR Pocket Guide: Working with communities and local authorities for the enhanced protection of refugees in urban areas, 2010

For example, in **DRC**, many IDPs find refuge with host families in communities close to their home areas while others seek shelter and greater income-generating possibilities in cities further afield. Over-crowding is generally greater in cities and social links are often weaker. IDPs are more likely to pay rent to their hosts, while in rural areas they work on the host’s farm or business to contribute to hosting expenses. In **Yemen** and **Lebanon**, the cultural context privileges hosting over camps. This requires a greater focus on the conditions of the host community and interventions to boost

their hosting capacities. In the urban displacement contexts of **Nairobi** (Kenya) and **Bogota** (Colombia), the service needs of a greater number of people can best be met through the capacity-building of community drop-in centres, rather than through individual assistance packages.

The importance of multi-sectoral assessments.

The depth of an assessment will largely depend on how urgently the intervention is needed. Both rapid and more in-depth assessments are necessary to determine the most appropriate intervention. Well-designed assessments increase knowledge about the living situation of IDPs and their hosts, their problems, coping strategies, social structures, needs and vulnerability. Each situation needs to be assessed separately to obtain details of the particular displacement conditions and determine the kind of assistance that would be most appropriate to specific needs. Assessments should try to establish baseline data by which to monitor changes resulting from an intervention.

Do an assessment of hosting absorption capacity in the initial assessment. This should include economic assessment and a simple livelihood analysis of indigenous inhabitants will likely suffice, if combined with some baselines on macro-economic prospects of the town. Collect data on hosting relationships (family, close friend, vaguely known, unknown, introduction mechanisms cross ethnicity etc.) to start understanding the hosting mechanism better.

Evaluation Project Umoja, Jeene, 2009

Ideally, in-depth multi-sectoral assessments should be quantitative, by means of a household survey with questionnaires, and qualitative, involving focus group discussions with IDP representatives, women's groups, local administrative bodies in schools and health facilities and others, as relevant. It is important to consider the intentions of the displaced, such as whether hosting is a temporary coping mechanism before returning home, or whether they wish to remain in the area (local settlement) or move elsewhere (resettlement). Multi-sectoral assessments are necessary to determine needs and intervention options: food, NFIs, shelter or water/sanitation improvements in host houses, or infrastructural improvements to the host community without specific regard for individual families. It may emerge from the assessment that assistance should target the most vulnerable, who may not necessarily be those in a hosting situation. Participatory assessments should include national or local authorities, where appropriate, and IDP representatives, in order to reveal important data that might otherwise be missed.

To target host communities we must collect information on population movement from a variety of sources: host family assessments, multi-sectoral rapid assessments, communications analyses, community knowledge and local authorities. This information needs to be synthesised and analysed by a central coordinating organisation, such as the Host Family Working Group with the support of the Early Recovery Cluster and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in Haiti.

IASC Host Community Guidelines, Haiti, June 2010

Timing

There is a tension between the considerable time needed to carry out an in-depth, multi-sectoral assessment and the time pressure to assist the displaced and their hosts before the former feel they are obliged to move again. Displacement – especially in fast-moving emergencies – may be fluid, with some families intending to remain for some time if the conditions are conducive, and others recognizing the burden they are placing on their hosts and feeling compelled to move on, or perceiving there may be advantages (including greater assistance) if they return to their former areas. Practitioners need to balance considerations of speed with thoroughness.

Responses must be community-based, with implementation starting quickly to incentivise the stay of the displaced people being targeted. As the hosting situation will be transitional in most cases, it is important to understand the host families and displaced families' intentions, and to develop community and household level responses, the former which will benefit longer-term development and mitigate future risks in those areas, and the latter which will benefit the transitional phase by ensuring that vulnerable people are targeted without returning to Port-au-Prince and further increasing needs in camps.

IASC Host Community Guidelines, Haiti, June 2010.

In some cases the situation may not allow for an in-depth assessment – especially where security issues or travel distances dictate only one-off visits to displacement sites. In such cases it may only be possible to conduct a rapid on-the-spot assessment and provide pre-selected assistance, such as NFIs, that the agency is able to transport in its vehicles – as in the case of UNHCR in **Kenya** in 2009. In Haiti, UNHCR participated as part of the Cluster protection team in multi-agency efforts (mainly with IFRC and INGOs) in elaborating guidelines, coordination mechanisms and systems to assist IDPs in host families in rural areas after the 2010 earthquake. But the lack of attention and funding for the assistance of this invisible side of displacement, combined with the limitations facing already indebted host families that could not cope with this new “burden”, led many IDPs families to return to an overcrowded Port-au-Prince for assistance before any assistance programme could get off the ground in the provinces. UNHCR managed to conduct rapid assessments in the border areas between **Haiti** and the **Dominican Republic** and was able to provide NFI assistance to the most vulnerable families in the host communities, and later to initiate Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) to support hosting capacities.

Community participation

Assistance to host communities can alleviate the pressure on resources experienced due to the arrival of big IDP influxes, if designed from the bottom up with community participation and respect for their preferences. Certain lessons can be drawn from the methodology used by the National Solidarity Programme in **Afghanistan**¹⁷ in empowering local communities to identify their priorities. Great care must be taken to ensure that assistance to individual families, whether IDPs or their hosts, is sanctioned by the community and does not create community tensions or individual

¹⁷ The National Solidarity Programme (NSP) develops the ability of Afghan communities to identify, plan, manage and monitor their own development projects. It works to empower rural communities to make decisions affecting their own lives and livelihoods, empowering them to collectively contribute to increased human security. <http://www.nspafghanistan.org/>

grievances. Community participation in assessments and programme design is key to avoiding such tensions, as are clear communications to the community regarding the intention and implementation of the programme.

Community participation in the full design, implementation and monitoring cycle allowed community members to feel in charge of the project – “maîtres de sa propre assistance.” It changed their minds from being passive recipients of aid to deciders on where and how to use it.

Interview with Aude Rigot, CARE DRC

In all the case studies reviewed, close community participation featured at all stages of intervention, with the exception of UNHCR’s on-the-spot targeting in **Kenya**. Even in this situation however, UNHCR managed to assist families from different ethnic groups, promoting harmony in communities that had earlier exacted violence on one another.

Commonly-agreed, context-specific vulnerability criteria

Vulnerability criteria, whether applicable to communities or individual families, should be commonly agreed by all humanitarian actors in each context. This should avoid inter-community tensions, which can arise where different standards are applied. Vulnerability criteria should be designed with particular regard to the context, as what might be appropriate for one context may not be for another. For example, in some contexts the most vulnerable may be returning IDPs whose houses have been destroyed, obliging them to live with neighbours and friends (**Lebanon**), whereas in another, they might be rural IDPs in hosting communities where they cannot produce their own food (**Haiti**, border with the Dominican Republic).

Targeting

When resources are particularly scarce, it may only be possible to assist people with specific needs (PSNs), and this must be communicated to the community. It may prove challenging to identify these among the rural or urban poor, and among PSNs themselves, as in the case of UNHCR’s intervention in **Somalia**. Communities should be the ones to perform the filter in most cases, to encourage buy-in and reduce the risk of jealousy. This was a major contributing factor to the success of a combined UNICEF, CARE, Oxfam and Concern assistance programme to vulnerable IDPs and families in urban slum communities of **Nairobi**. On the other hand, where targeting individuals could contribute to community tensions in situations of chronic poverty, it may be more appropriate to implement a programme that is useful to everyone in the community, such as in the case of community drop-in centres in **Bogota**.

Verification of beneficiaries

Where communities perform beneficiary selection, adequate verification mechanisms must be carried out and if necessary, the whole list rejected or revised if unjustifiable bias is detected. Verification can be done by taking a random sample of beneficiaries or, where possible, by visiting every potential beneficiary household. Most verification exercises reveal a small but not statistically significant number of non-eligible beneficiaries.

Verification is generally well-accepted as it is seen as an effort of equity. In almost all of the households where verification was done, the verified host family was (before verification) or is actually (at moment of verification) hosting IDPs. Only 2 host families or 0,4% of the sample did not host IDPs at all.

Cash for Host Families, Aceh 2005 - SDC

In the **Philippines**, WFP's partner CFSI found that beneficiary lists produced for Cash and Food for Work programmes were inflated by between 30-50% upon verification. In **Lebanon**, insecurity precluded UNHCR from visiting certain conflict-affected communities and beneficiary lists of vulnerable families could not be verified. In the **DRC**, Oxfam was obliged to reject a whole list when verification revealed unacceptable bias.

A sample verification form can be found in **Annex D**.

Monitoring

Whatever the assistance programme implemented, close monitoring is necessary during each phase (progress, results and impact monitoring) to ensure that programme objectives are being met, to detect and redress possible abuse of resources, and to make adjustments where necessary. Monitoring permits complaints to be handled adequately and for suitable follow-up projects to be designed. It should ensure that cross-cutting issues have been considered, such as environmental impact of community infrastructure, checking that vulnerability criteria has been respected and that the gender balance is appropriate to the context. In some projects, hosted IDPs may be predominantly women, children and older persons if men are working far from the hosting site.

Monitoring has become a standard in Cash Projects. The results are important for accountability towards donors, to check whether support was an adequate answer to humanitarian needs, and to increase knowledge for follow-up projects bridging relief work with rehabilitation.

SDC Cash Workbook

In a pre-election context of food distribution monitoring in the **Philippines**, WFP's local partner CFSI found political parties trying to claim credit for food aid in a CFW programme for host communities by draping their banners over the packages. Careful monitoring allows for such issues to be promptly addressed.

Contact with beneficiaries

Regular interaction with beneficiaries and host community leaders substantially contributes to reducing frictions, problems and complaints. It allows for detection of problems before they become critical and heads off potential complaints with information updates and explanations.

Potential beneficiaries take note of what humanitarian projects do and appreciate transparent and strict application of what has been announced.

Cash for Host Families – SDC, 2005

Transparency and accountability

Ensuring that information about a project is widely accessible can have a number of benefits, and can also reduce uncertainty and avert potential criticism:

- Public information on progress and results increases the credibility of the approach and the visibility of the agency and its donors.
- Properly announced information regarding project aims, beneficiary targeting and selection, list of benefits items, delivery mechanisms, redress mechanisms – as well as what the project does not do - reduces uncertainties among the population in general, and among the local administration and other humanitarian actors.

If you decide not to support health education or water because these services are in principle available at a price in the area, say so explicitly.

Evaluation Project Umoja, Jeene, 2009

- Good public relations with the population create awareness, stimulating public attention and thus helping to reduce attempts at misuse. This also ensures that the project approach and its advantages are better understood and expectations concerning direct financial contributions remain realistic.
- Good relationships with local authorities and other partners help to demonstrate the project's purely humanitarian purpose, minimizing the risk of political interference or exploitation.
- Public information on redress mechanisms allows host families who may have been missed to come forward. Grievances can be investigated and redressed where warranted.
- Accountability to beneficiaries keeps grievances at a minimum and reduces possible community tensions.

In order to prevent or mitigate inter-community tensions, assistance should always be preceded by community sensitization campaigns around the rights of IDPs and the targeting of assistance.

Assistance Strategy for Host Families and Communities – CCHD, DRC

Conflict sensitivity and protection issues

Conflict sensitivity is crucial in both urban and rural settings. Assessments and monitoring should include questions to the population on their risk perceptions and consultations with them about appropriate assistance delivery to minimize problems such as looting, burning and theft (for example, it is known that thatch burns, and iron sheets attract looters). Monitoring and regular interaction with communities is necessary to ensure the assistance has fulfilled its aim without harming people and property. Monitoring can also reveal instances of hosts exploiting IDPs or vice versa. Exploitation aspects – especially SGBV – need to be considered in assessments where individual families, women and children are beneficiaries.

4.2. Other Lessons Learned from the Case Studies

Support to host communities

In situations where communities are affected significantly by hosting IDPs, community support can result in the expansion of services to alleviate overuse, greater school attendance of IDP children and the build-up of trust between the authorities, community members and international donors. (Serbia)

‘Knowledge-based’ assistance can be just as important as the provision of material goods in some community-based interventions. It can raise human rights and rule of law awareness while reducing tensions through the interaction of different clans and religions, obliged to live side by side in crowded spaces. (Somalia)

Support to community centres can equip staff to collect data on the nature of protection and other problems faced by visitors to the centre, and to devise measures to address them. Centres can also be used in profiling the characteristics of communities, by collecting data on hosting arrangements, IDPs, refugees, the prevalence of HIV/AIDS etc (Nairobi, Colombia).

Because of the importance of understanding each community’s distinct hierarchical structures, agencies must learn who are the key communicators and leaders, and work with them, rather than create new structures. Sensitivity and ingenuity are needed to reach out to women in male-dominated communities. (Yemen, Somalia).

Peace-building through support to host families and communities

In hosting areas where the hosts are of different ethnicities to the IDPs, supporting host communities can promote confidence-building, peace and reconciliation between and within communities through inter-ethnic, inter-community dialogue. Host communities became more accepting of the displaced and agreed to contribute land for housing (Somalia).

Apart from the immediate impact of expanding community infrastructure and assisting vulnerable individuals, a related impact of combined projects is confidence-building between ethnic groups who participate in committee decision-making. Peace-building is an integral part of the process. (Lebanon).

The impact on traditional solidarity deserves much stronger support from the humanitarian community. In Goma, DRC, about 20-25% of the hosting was between total strangers, and five cases

of hosting across ethnic and linguistic barriers were noted. This was considered remarkable in a conflict with distinct ethnic and linguistic dimensions. The high levels of empathy were explained by the fact that most people in the area had undergone displacement themselves at least once or twice, either due to conflict or the 2002 volcanic eruption. The shared suffering of these displacements, and the low level of confidence in politicians, led to high solidarity at grassroots level, also across ethnic lines. Such potential for grass-roots peace-building deserves further attention and may well turn out to be the most important long term contribution of a project. (Goma).

Vulnerability and Targeting

Approaches to vulnerability and targeting are remarkably similar throughout the case studies. A ‘vulnerability’ approach to targeting can be more appropriate than singling out individual IDP or host families for assistance because there is no discrimination according to ‘status’, and communities accept it more readily. Given the general vulnerability of IDPs and their hosts, many of them fit the vulnerability criteria anyway. If targeting IDPs in host families is the aim (to satisfy donor requirements of assisting IDPs, for example), this must be clearly explained to the community. Donors may accept including a percentage of other vulnerable families in the interests of maintaining harmony.

Vulnerability criteria should be commonly agreed within the appropriate inter-agency coordination mechanism and with individual communities. Community sensitization and community-based targeting is critical to ensure local ownership. However, the degree and nature of vulnerability can vary between communities and the distinctions between chronic and extreme vulnerability need to be established according to individual contexts and communities.

Statistics

Understanding the dimensions of hosting can be challenging. Statistics on hosting have until recently been largely unavailable and un-collected. Obtaining them is a very complex undertaking due to the mobility of the IDP population, so there has been little evidence-base for selecting host families as a vulnerable group in need of support. This is beginning to change: humanitarian assessments in the DRC increasingly incorporate questions regarding hosting numbers and profiles, as well as displacement and returnee numbers, making it easier for agencies to identify hosting communities and plan community-based assistance.

Community drop-in centres may act as an indirect avenue for gathering statistics on IDPs in urban areas. As a hub for all community members to anonymously seek information on a range of issues, the data filtered according to the nature of inquiries (whether person-to-person or electronic ‘hits’) can build a gradual profile of community characteristics and concerns. The centres can also match IDPs with families willing to host them (as in the case of Tunisia).

Protection Issues

It is important to consider whether a hosting support intervention may create or exacerbate protection problems. Hosting can cause various protection concerns when families are over-crowded (SGBV) and IDPs can be exploited by their hosts in different ways. IDPs should have a choice: to stay with host families or to move into camps if they consider that their safety concerns are better addressed in camps.

Cash-based programmes

Cash transfer programmes can be highly effective if implemented responsibly, and abuse of cash has not been an issue in the cases reviewed. IDPs tend to share the money with their hosts in the purchase of needed food and NFIs. Empowering recipients and giving them choice support individual coping strategies, and the multiplier effect creates a positive economic impact on the community. Sustainable impact from cash assistance has been observed in the form of improved livelihoods for beneficiaries. Cash assistance programmes reviewed did not create noticeable inflation or food shortages.

The SDC Aceh, ACF Nakuru and Helvetas Sri Lanka cash programmes demonstrate that emergency cash transfer programmes can be implemented even in densely populated and insecure urban areas. Close collaboration with banking systems can enhance the sustainability and continuity of activities through future access to micro-finance and credit after the end of a programme. Banking is relevant for sophisticated societies and urban areas, whereas an alternative method through mobile phone transfers can be made to individuals in rural areas where there are no bank facilities.

Ultimately, the key consideration for any intervention should be: what resource transfer approach in a given context would be most effective to address assessed needs, while being acceptable to the target population? This question should underpin all stages of the project cycle.

5. Steps towards an assistance framework

The above examples show that carefully-planned and targeted support to IDP hosting can be relevant, effective, efficient and with high positive impact. The main challenge to date is in securing sufficient resources, even when the needs and likely benefits are clear. However, donor support is unlikely to be significant unless humanitarian actors can make a better, more concrete case for it as an emergency intervention. This will require (1) improved statistics and information about the humanitarian situation of IDPs in host families and host communities, and, (2) routinely tabled discussions within humanitarian country teams, the IASC and clusters on the feasibility, advantages and disadvantages of all hosting options to address a variety of needs among different groups and areas. Advocacy to donors also needs to be increased to recognize the worth of such programmes as early recovery interventions, linking relief and longer-term development. Cluster and Sectoral Working Groups should routinely consider not just commodity supply and numbers of people in need, but also what the most appropriate resource transfer options, including cash and voucher transfers, might be for different groups/needs.¹⁸

The following provides a ‘scenario framework’ to guide decision-makers in choosing the kind of assistance programme that is appropriate to their particular context. The overriding objective is to improve the protection of IDPs who opt to stay with host families over staying in camps, or who have little other choice because camps are not available.

¹⁸ Recommendation from a DG ECHO report: *Evaluation and Review of the Use of Cash and Vouchers in Humanitarian Crises*, http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/evaluation/2008/cash_review_report.pdf

SCENARIO FRAMEWORK

Context (urban/rural, conflict or rapid onset disaster) and Characteristics	Applicable / Inadvisable	Aims and Assistance Modality Options
<p>Unstable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult access • Mobile population • Imprecise estimates • Resource crash • IDPs retain some resources 	<p>Applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blanket distribution • Rapid disaggregated estimates <p>Inadvisable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single out IDPs or HF 	<p>Emergency relief to affected population</p> <p>Modalities:</p> <p>Food, NFIs, shelter, while preparing design of more targeted interventions</p>
<p>Semi-Stable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access possible • Surveys/estimates possible • IDP resources exhausted • Pendulum hosting • Community tensions over scarce resources 	<p>Applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint, multi-sectoral needs assessments of IDPs/ hosts, other vulnerable groups, host communities, including for early recovery • Vulnerability targeting <p>Inadvisable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blanket food assistance • Cash or vouchers if markets are disrupted • Ignore needs of host community 	<p>Support to IDPs and hosts to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce tensions • Prevent secondary displacement <p>Modalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual: Cash/vouchers where markets are operating normally, NFIs, psycho-social support • Community: drop-in centres, infrastructure support, QIPs • Verification, monitoring, adjusting
<p>Stable (also for slow onset emergencies):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Forgotten emergencies’ • Protracted displacement • IDPs/HF - invisible/ anonymous/ scattered • IDPs move further away from home areas • IDPs host other IDPs • Chronic impoverishment of IDPs, hosts • Community tensions over scarce resources 	<p>Applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based support • Community Outreach • Target most vulnerable • Study existing coping mechanisms • Early recovery, development, peace-building interventions 	<p>Support to most vulnerable IDPs and hosts</p> <p>Safeguard anonymity of people visiting community drop-in centres</p> <p>Modalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted NFIs, cash/vouchers, QIPs, psychosocial, community drop-in centres, social outreach, support to reconciliation mechanisms • Verification, monitoring, adjusting

6. Conclusions

A number of common themes can be drawn from the case studies under review, summarized as follows:

Leadership and advocacy: While donor and practitioner attention to IDPs in hosting situations is beginning to gain traction, efforts are still fragmented and uncoordinated globally. Global leadership to develop policy and advocate for greater resources has been lacking, undermined by the dual challenges of privileging ‘business as usual’ assistance models to camp-based interventions and weak evidence-based advocacy to donors. Even in Haiti, where the Shelter Cluster developed strategies and guidelines to support host families in outlying provinces, donors were slow to respond. Assistance to IDPs in camps in disaster-affected areas was considered a higher life-saving priority.

Positive results: The case studies show that, where UNHCR and other agencies had the will and the flexibility to pilot assistance programmes to IDPs in hosting situations, the results have been positive and widespread, appreciated by communities that would otherwise have suffered greater deprivation and stress. Not only do such programmes promote greater community harmony and lessen the risk of conflict over resources, they can be cost-effective life-saving mechanisms to vulnerable individuals.

Challenges: The diverse contexts in which IDPs outside camps find themselves require an expanded toolbox to address them in contextually appropriate ways. The case studies show that agencies are starting to experiment with different tools - but challenges remain to increase these and use them more systematically in areas where hosting is the predominant displacement coping mechanism.

The Cluster System is struggling to find adequate leadership for a coordinated approach to assisting IDPs outside camps, whether in hosting or rental situations. A joint approach is necessary to respond to cross-cutting needs, yet it can be challenging – especially in field locations – to identify the most appropriate Cluster lead.

The humanitarian community continues to operate on a ‘supply driven’ basis, intervening to assist IDPs and their hosts according to agency mandates and following pre-set assumptions of what they will deliver. A more ‘demand driven’ approach would aim at finding out and responding to what host communities and individual families really need. For instance, agencies are used to delivering material goods as this has been the predominant model for years, involving logistics and purchasing expertise which the agencies already have. But are materials really what the beneficiaries need most? Could post-aid distribution make people more vulnerable to protection threats? Is it the most cost-effective means of aid delivery? It requires a different set of skills (that agencies may not readily possess) to design a cash or voucher-based programme, but in reality, this might be the most appropriate assistance modality.

Identifying and registering scattered and sometimes ‘invisible’ beneficiaries in multiple locations can prove challenging, but there are mechanisms to do it.

Getting the timing right for complex, multi-sectoral assessments and interventions can be difficult in unstable and fluid situations.

In a wider context, if the intention is to reduce vulnerability, or to prevent families and communities from becoming vulnerable as a result of hosting IDPs, greater focus will be needed on targeting and assisting host families and communities as a specific group of concern. Consideration of this would need to be given at the conceptualization stage of an assistance programme by asking the question: What are we trying to achieve?

7. Recommendations

The country case studies conducted for this study and the Scenario Framework can provide humanitarian actors with a certain level of confidence and guidance on how to proceed with developing programmes in support of IDPs in hosting situations. The material can be used as a platform for individual country policy and programming, adapted to each particular context.

In a wider context, the humanitarian community now needs stronger commitment to, and leadership in, assisting the obvious majority of IDPs who reside outside camps in hosting arrangements. While the Cluster System is an appropriate forum to advocate for inter-agency endeavour, there is no single determinant as to which Cluster should lead assistance to IDPs in hosting situations. At the field level, the choice of a lead might differ according to the context. This being a cross-Cluster endeavour, it is important that the issue be addressed through inter-Cluster coordination at both global and field levels.

UNHCR has developed a number of innovative tools to protect and assist refugees that could be usefully applied in IDP hosting situations. These include the UNHCR Pocket Guide to Working with Communities and Local Authorities, the Heightened Risk Identification Tool and the Participatory Protection Assessment. Other existing tools oriented for IDPs include the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPs), an advisory service for IDP profiling; the Host Community Guidelines, developed by the Haiti IASC Shelter Cluster, and many others. These tools need to be systematically collected and made available on a dedicated website easily accessible to humanitarian actors and other interested parties, including national governments.

In all but a few cases, a community-based approach should be privileged over an individual one. Host communities should be the primary target of an assistance programme. Assessments should be targeted at the community level initially, and then community elders should be asked to provide information on the most vulnerable individual families among them – not the other way round. This would give greater recognition to the role that communities themselves play and would empower them to make choices that would result in the greatest collective benefit in sharing the burden of hosting. Individual family selection can follow.

In order to better understand the impact of hosting, it would be useful to conduct studies that look at the same group of families before and after hosting, as well as studies that explicitly compare the vulnerabilities of host families with those of non-host families. It would also be useful to systematically collect and analyze data on vulnerable families to see how many of these are hosting IDPs.

Acronyms

CCHD	Coordination of Host Communities and the Displaced
CfHF	Cash for Host Families
CFSI	Community and Family Services International
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
LRRD	Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
QIPs	Quick Impact Projects
SDC	Agency for Swiss Cooperation and Development
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence

IDPs	The <i>Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement</i> define internally displaced persons as “Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border”. ²⁰
Planned Camp	Planned camps are places where displaced populations find accommodation on purpose-built sites and a full services infrastructure is provided, including water supply, food distribution, non-food item distribution, education, and health care, usually exclusively for the population of the site. ²¹ Collective Centres or Evacuation Centres are considered planned camps.
Self –Settled and Spontaneous Camps	Unplanned camps are often located on state-owned, private or communal land, usually after limited negotiations with the local population or private owners over use and access. Sites may include religious buildings, schools or other administrative buildings, an open field or an open area within a community. Camps may range in size from small groups of families to thousands of persons. Self-settled and spontaneous camps may receive intermittent humanitarian aid or no aid at all.
Host Community	A community which has IDPs living in the homes of community members and/or in spontaneous or formal camps nearby.
Host Family	A family living within a host community which is hosting IDPs within their own home.
Hosted IDPs	IDPs living in a host family household or community.
Pendulum Hosting	A hosting relationship which enables a displaced person or family to periodically return to their home areas to monitor security of their homes, property or crops.

¹⁹ Adapted from: *Internal Displacement in North Kivu: Hosting, Camps, and Coping Mechanisms*, UNICEF, 2008.

²⁰ Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. <http://www.idpguidingprinciples.org/>

²¹ CCCM definition

Detailed Case Studies

Examples of assistance methods and models

This Annex provides a more detailed examination of examples of assistance to hosting arrangements as a supplement to the short summaries given in the body of the Study. Experiences described in the Study are not reproduced here, except where additional detail is helpful from a lesson-learning point of view.

The examples cover the three main approaches detected, namely:

- a) Assistance to Host Communities
 - Host Community infrastructure improvement
 - Support to Host Community Service Centres
- b) Combination of Assistance to Host Families and Host Communities
- c) Assistance to IDPs in Host Families
 - Cash-based
 - Non cash-based
 - Combination of cash-based and non-cash-based

a) Examples of Assistance to Host Communities

Host Community Infrastructure Improvement

EXAMPLE 1

Context: In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC, mainly in North Kivu), waves of displacement have been occurring over the past decade due to conflict and a growing climate of generalized violence. The Congolese tradition of solidarity has been severely taxed by the growing numbers of IDPs in host communities, resulting in depletion of community and personal assets, growing malnutrition and deteriorating health, risking tensions over scarce resources and a growing impoverishment in a region rich with natural resources. Displacement statistics are difficult to pin down due to 'pendulum' displacement and the general fluidity of population movements.

Methodology: UNICEF and Oxfam coordinated pilot assistance programmes to provide infrastructural improvements to communities with a high incidence of IDP hosting. Subsequent to in-depth assessments, Oxfam and UNICEF selected host communities that were also accessible and sufficiently secure to permit intervention. Oxfam improved water availability by technical interventions to upgrade water catchment areas and supply, and provided community latrines to improve the hygiene situation. UNICEF provided emergency schools in villages where IDP children were unable to attend due to space limitations, as well as hygiene training in schools. Both interventions employed community labour.

Results: The pilot projects were successful in expanding community infrastructure and in providing a modicum of relief for the overstretched IDP host communities. The agencies recognize however that these are small and scattered initiatives that need to be scaled up to provide greater coverage of communities hosting high influxes of IDPs.

A major challenge is advocating for such interventions as emergency tools when they are clearly more of a development nature. They demonstrate the blurred lines between relief, recovery and development that donors, as well as operational agencies, have trouble fitting into traditional 'funding envelopes'. However, ECHO is starting to encompass such interventions under emergency relief, recognizing the need to assist IDPs in situations outside camps with a wider array of tools.

EXAMPLE 2

Context: In Liberia, refugees seeking asylum from the 2011 post-election political violence affecting the Cote d'Ivoire have settled in communities in border areas. These have been traditional asylum areas in previous Cote d'Ivoire conflicts and many people have long-established cross-border trading networks and family affiliations.

Methodology: UNHCR and its partners are currently in the process of planning and establishing new refugee camps in the area and, in the meantime, have been offering assistance to the communities hosting the refugees. Food, water, shelter materials and other NFIs are provided by different agencies in order to support the host communities and IDPs living among them. Statistics are gathered by the community and verified by the agencies. Data-gathering is challenging due to new numbers arriving on a daily basis, but registration is possible through house-to-house verification.

The aim of assisting the host community is to support refugees' coping mechanisms, as well as alleviate the strain on the community, while the camps are being built. Agencies plan to continue support to host communities surrounding the future camps, such as access to schooling and other basic services from the camp where necessary. It is too early to say at the time of writing if vulnerable families in the host community will also be targeted for assistance – but this could be a good way to mitigate possible tensions.

Although this is a refugee context, the rationale and methodology of support to host communities is similar to IDP contexts.

Support to Host Community Service Centres

EXAMPLE 1

Context: In **Colombia**, different waves of displacement over several decades have increased the urban suburb population and placed enormous strains and tensions on receiving communities – themselves the result of earlier displacements. It is very difficult to single out individual assistance schemes due to the level of violence in certain areas and difficulties in ensuring equity. However, one assistance delivery platform is the provision of certain services through community centres. This is in a context of strong government policy towards protecting and assisting IDPs and a strong civil society, active in many community assistance programmes.

Methodology

- *Casas de los Derechos* (House of Rights) are run by Colombia's National Ombudsman's Office with the support of UNHCR. These are drop-in centres that assist all individuals in the community to access their rights to basic services: health, education, documentation, security, etc. By analyzing the nature of services sought, the centres are able to gather information on a cross-section of vulnerabilities, including a profile of displacement.
- *Plan de Todos* is another drop-in service centre run by the municipal education institution in a high IDP receptor area, Soacha municipality, Bogota, to provide protection outreach to child victims of domestic violence in non-homogeneous communities. Families meet at weekends, and children receive schooling and help with homework while parents receive literacy programmes and participate in community conscience and human rights talks. The aim is to awaken people's awareness to violence in society by offering literacy and civic education - which can also boost their income-generation potential. Benefits include increasing the pool of skills providers, creating a protection ring, enhancing social capital that helps to reduce domestic violence and the threats and actions of warlords, and alleviating the pressures placed by incoming IDPs on the community.

EXAMPLE 2

Context: In **Kenya**, UNHCR's implementing partner the International Rescue Committee supported community information centres in the Nairobi community of Eastleigh in 2009 and 2010. The rationale was more to assist urban refugees than IDPs but the success of the pilot initiative has led the agency to plan for additional centres that would assist the entire community in each catchment area.

Methodology: Support to the community centre in Eastleigh consisted of offering a range of services, including refugee registration – though many refugees did not register as they understood their presence in Nairobi to be illegal and they feared deportation. Information services to the refugees allowed staff to collect data on the nature of protection and other problems faced by visitors to the centre, and to devise measures to address them.

EXAMPLE 3

Context: In **Lebanon**, in the aftermath of the 2006 conflict with Israel, UNHCR partnered with the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) to assist Social Development Centres (SDCs) in urban areas while another partner, Intersos, assisted IDP host communities through Quick Impact Projects (QIPs). The aim of the SDC programme was to build the capacity of the SDCs in conflict-affected areas to provide improved services to the vulnerable.

Methodology: The initiative was implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Social Affairs. A grant of between US\$ 2,000 to 15,000 was provided to selected SDCs, enabling the centres to expand their services to community visitors, including IDPs, their hosts and other vulnerable people. The grants were used for additional furnishings, staff, staff training, medical referrals, etc. The model was considered useful for this context, where host communities had been overwhelmed by IDPs and were themselves very poor. A lesson learned from the experience was to have reserve funds for each centre to cover the immediate needs of particularly vulnerable individuals.

b) Combination of Assistance to Host Families and Host Communities

The rationale for this model is based on recognition that not only are host families at risk of gradual impoverishment through their role as primary aid responders to IDPs, the host communities also suffer from depleted or over-stretched resources, having a negative effect on their economic and social well-being.

EXAMPLE 1

Context: In conflict-affected areas of Eastern DRC, UNICEF worked through INGO partners within its emergency programme 'Réponse Rapide aux Mouvements de la Population' (RRMP, or Rapid Response to Population Movements). CARE DRC undertook separate programmes in neighbouring communities. The aim of both agencies was to assist:

- Individual IDP host families through food and NFIs;
- Communities affected by displacement through improvements to community infrastructure, such as water and sanitation systems, extension of schools and health centres.

Methodology: Host communities were identified by reports of massive displacement movements from the Comités de Mouvement de la Population (CMPs), RRMP assessments and OCHA. Subsequent in-depth multi-sectoral assessments initially focused on identifying the most vulnerable families hosting IDPs. During the course of the assessments it became apparent that the communities themselves were suffering from severe over-crowding and degraded infrastructure from the pressure of hosting so many newcomers. The assessment recommendations led both agencies to re-define programmes to assist both groups.

Targeting in the case of UNICEF was individual vulnerable families, not necessarily in a hosting situation. In other words, the focus was on vulnerability not 'status' of any kind. Upon registration of beneficiaries in the programme it emerged that many of the most vulnerable, according to the criteria that UNICEF used, were indeed host families and IDPs in host families. Others included in the vulnerability criteria were female-headed households (FHH), child-headed households, the elderly and people with disabilities. In the case of CARE, vulnerable host families were the primary target with selection criteria based on the numbers of IDPs hosted over a minimum of three months. At the request of the community, other non IDP hosting vulnerable families were included: FHH, child-headed households, the elderly and people with disabilities. Assistance was in the form of NFIs to each family.

UNICEF's assistance to registered beneficiaries took the form of NFIs, the same items provided to beneficiaries of the wider Rapid Response Mechanism programme: domestic and hygiene items, mosquito nets and water containers, for a value of approximately US\$ 50 per kit. Post-distribution monitoring showed that 5% of NFIs were distributed to IDPs in host families and that all items were used, not sold. Some beneficiaries attested to sharing their items with other families in the community or swapping items.

CARE's assistance was entirely voucher-based, aimed at revitalizing local markets and the local economy as well as supporting individual families. Vouchers were distributed to beneficiaries and CARE entered into contracts with local vendors who assured competitive prices and local, not external, produce. Families could exchange their vouchers for a variety of household goods, food and shelter materials at local markets. The communities themselves attested to their satisfaction at boosting the local economy by this method. Follow-up monitoring by a combination of CARE staff and community representatives ensured that materials were being used for intended purposes (especially shelter items that could easily be re-sold) and to register complaints, reiterate key communication messages and resolve any tensions.

Both UNICEF and CARE provided infrastructure support to the host communities, respecting their choices and priorities. These included: improvements to water and sanitation systems, schools and community centre upgrading. The agencies provided material inputs and technical assistance while the community supplied the labour.

An adjunct to the CARE programme was a partnership with UNHCR, which provided shelter assistance to IDP host families in order to reduce protection problems (SGBV, young people crowded together, rental extraction from the hosts) due to over-crowding in small houses and to expand housing space. CARE included shelter beneficiaries within its assessment and registration and the shelter materials provided were funded by UNHCR.

Results: Through these two separate but related programmes, 800 host families and 31 other vulnerable families in the communities were directly assisted. Community participation in determining vulnerability criteria and beneficiary selection ensured buy-in and acceptance by the community, avoiding tensions. CARE reported that communities came to see themselves as main actors of the programme rather than passive aid recipients, both in selecting priority upgrading projects and vulnerable families and in implementing the infrastructure upgrades.

Lessons learned:

- Assistance to IDPs in host families and communities is at a very rudimentary stage in Eastern DRC despite the fact that most agencies recognize that more needs to be done to help these 'primary aid responders'. More systematic methodologies need to be developed and experiments with vouchers and cash need to be scaled up.
- The Cluster system finds it challenging to deal with multi-sectoral needs assessments and assistance. There is little inter-sector Cluster innovation in terms of multi-sectoral approaches and initiatives and greater cross-cluster leadership is needed. These are complex issues requiring an inter-agency approach and there is a Cluster systemic reluctance to tackle them despite recognizing the need.
- UNICEF found that the vulnerability approach is appropriate because there is no discrimination according to 'status' and communities accept it.
- CARE found that targeting host families satisfies donor requirements of assisting IDPs and allows it also to include non-hosting vulnerable families targeted by the communities.
- UNHCR considers that assistance to host families and communities should be seen through a protection prism: hosting can cause various protection concerns when families are over-crowded (GBV) and IDPs can be exploited by their hosts in different ways. IDPs should have a choice: to stay with host families or to move into camps if they consider that their safety concerns are better addressed in camps.
- It can be inappropriate (and would be, in this particular context) to provide assistance to individual families only, without taking into account the urgent needs of the host community – and vice versa. This forms the basis of the two-pronged approach.

EXAMPLE 2

Context: The January 2010 earthquake in **Haiti** killed or injured about half a million people and displaced an estimated two million people.²² Some 160,000 moved to the region bordering the **Dominican Republic** (DR) while others were allowed into the DR to seek medical attention. The vast majority of the IDPs were accommodated with host families, both in urban as well as rural areas, in precarious economic conditions. UNHCR decided to adopt a two-pronged approach of providing individual NFI assistance to IDPs in host families and Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) to assist host communities in both countries. The rationale of the projects was to operate in areas where less humanitarian attention had been focused, to promote cohabitation and reduce tensions between IDPs and host communities and to enhance the monitoring capacity of the Protection Cluster. Income-generation is aimed at helping IDPs achieve self reliance and prevent further displacement.

Methodology: Rapid assessments with community participation resulted in programme design of two assistance methods: provision of NFIs to individual IDPs in host families and Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) to assist host communities. Communities identified an estimated 240,000 vulnerable IDPs and their hosts, who received kitchen and hygiene kits two weeks after the emergency. QIPs take longer to implement. They were identified by IDP hosting communities and cover protection, income generation, shelter, health and education needs. A cross-sample of QIPs in both countries includes: installation of water tanks in host communities to supplement water provision; income-generation activities for women, micro-credit, restoration and upgrading of schools, health centres and community centres, construction of latrines, training in water restoration, disaster management and micro-credit. Many QIPs target vulnerable groups such as women at risk or persons with disabilities. A cash-for-work component provides resources for persons whose employment prospects are very slim. The QIPs are implemented through local or international NGOs working in the communities. Budgets for individual QIPs range from US\$ 50 to 75,000.

Results: So far a total of 53 community-based QIPs have been launched, benefiting an estimated 100,000 persons in both countries.

QIPs promote empowerment and integration of IDPs and the host community through their joint participation in the design, implementation and monitoring of the projects. Training on IDP protection issues has built partner and beneficiary skills. Participants learn about the displacement experience and the particular vulnerability of IDPs and learn to use concrete tools on simple protection monitoring and mainstreaming, participatory assessments, vulnerability assessments, etc.

A close relationship with local actors and authorities has been established, allowing a good understanding of protection needs.

UNHCR's operational presence has enabled it to have an active role in monitoring the border area between Haiti and the Dominican Republic and enhancing the protection mechanisms within the local authorities and local actors such as NGOs.

Challenges to assisting IDPs in hosting situations in Haiti:

- While piecemeal interventions have taken place to assist hosted IDPs, the international community and the Government of Haiti focused insufficient attention and support for the IDP host communities in rural areas that witnessed a large scale influx since the earthquake. Some two thirds of these IDPs subsequently returned to Port au Prince – precisely due to lack of timely support in their hosted situations. At the time of writing, an estimated 200,000 or more remained in host families and communities in need of assistance. The greatest obstacle in reaching out to them is lack of resources: donors tend to prioritize assistance to IDPs in camps.
- The needs of host communities (and IDPs living in host communities) can differ significantly from the needs of IDPs in camp situations. For instance, during UNHCR's first interagency rapid needs assessment in January/February 2010, local leaders expressed that seeds were a priority item rather than food items because: a) they had a stock of food for the incoming population; b) they knew they would eventually be short of food; c) they wanted to avoid as much as possible dependency on food items; d) cultivating land would be a livelihood for IDPs who had just arrived; e) cultivating land for IDPs would be an activity which could integrate better IDPs into

²² This section is informed by UNHCR's situation report: *Haiti Eight Months After the Earthquake*, October 2010

host communities and provide psychosocial support/ networks (most of IDPs living in host communities had nothing to do all day and were still traumatized about the earthquake). However, the FAO budget was very small compared to WFP's budget and was not in a position to do any distribution of seeds in border areas at that time. As FAO explained, many donors did not see seeds as "emergency". However, within this rural context, it would have been the preferred solution for IDPs living with host families.

EXAMPLE 3

Context: In **Lebanon**, in the aftermath of the 2006 conflict with Israel, UNHCR partnered with the INGO Intersos to assist communities and individual families in return areas through a combination of QIPs and individual assistance to host families. The aim of the programme was to assist the return process - through asset recovery and services - by providing non-discriminatory assistance to all ethnic groups who had suffered in conflict and disaster alike.

Methodology: Twenty teams undertook assessments of conflict-affected villages in return areas, in partnership with local community representatives, to appraise damage and priority needs. Villages selected for inclusion in the programme were the worst-affected. Communities were asked to formulate QIPs to address infrastructure needs and the most urgent needs of especially vulnerable families or individuals. It was immaterial as to whether or not selected families were hosting or hosted, the main criteria was their degree of vulnerability. Upon registration it emerged that many of the most vulnerable families were in fact in hosting arrangements. Vulnerability criteria included persons with special needs, the elderly, children and adolescents within the conflict-affected population. The QIPs were selected by a committee and comprised repair to essential infrastructure in villages, food for elderly vulnerable people for one month, assistance to women's cooperatives for the production of olive oil, home help to the elderly or infirm for one month, advocacy with village sheiks to resolve protection problems in individual families, *inter alia*.

Results: Apart from the immediate impact of restoring community infrastructure and assisting vulnerable individuals, a related impact of the projects was confidence-building between ethnic groups who participated in committee decision-making. The project fulfilled its aim of assisting the peace-building process.

EXAMPLE 4

Context: In **Somalia (Somaliland)** in 2006, UNHCR stepped up its assistance to individual IDPs and returning refugees in areas where there were high concentrations of these groups, mainly urban areas - Hargeisa and Burao - and their peripheries. In addition, pilot projects were initiated to assist host communities in Somaliland. The context was highly complex:

- A mixed population (IDPs, returnees, host, and migrants from neighbouring Ethiopia) were living together in settlements and their outskirts. Coupled with fluid population movements, this made it difficult to identify or keep track of IDPs.
- Increasing numbers of IDPs and returnees were staying with host families within clan structures or renting in the communities, some of the returnees having chosen to move from other parts of Somaliland to urban areas.
- Conflict and natural disasters in the South/Central areas are the main displacement drivers, also comprising migrational nomads.
- Clan protection is vital in Somali culture. However IDPs from South/Central Somalia belong to different clans and thus do not enjoy clan protection in Somaliland. This creates more vulnerability.
- Somaliland has self-declared its independence, which is not yet recognized by the international community. There were thus differences of opinion regarding people displaced from South and Central Somalia. Somaliland authorities consider them refugees while UNHCR and other international humanitarian agencies maintain that they are IDPs. Through extensive discussions with authorities, an understanding was reached to provide assistance to the displaced based on a commonly agreed vulnerability criteria instead of "status" or place of origin. As a result, those from South/Central Somalia, the majority being extremely vulnerable, were prioritized to receive assistance.
- Given the general level of poverty in all hosting communities, it was challenging to come up with vulnerability criteria that distinguished chronic poverty from extreme vulnerability.

Methodology: Local authorities participated in formulating the criteria and organizing and monitoring the vulnerability survey and finally compiling lists of the most vulnerable in their communities. Vulnerability criteria included large families sharing a single shelter, ie. those numbering over six family members, living in makeshift shelters of plastic, sticks and mud, Female headed households, unaccompanied minors (UAM), people with disability and the elderly. UNHCR verified the lists through house-to-house visits. Assistance was in the form of plastic sheeting to enlarge makeshift dwellings to accommodate large families, and NFIs to other vulnerable families. From registration lists it emerged that many of the vulnerable families were hosting IDPs in over-crowded housing. Post-distribution monitoring showed that beneficiaries used the assistance materials.

Assistance to community infrastructure was selected according to the degree of over-crowdedness and degradation of infrastructure as well as associated potential protection risks in settlement areas. 'State House' settlement located in the Somaliland capital suffered from the worst conditions and was accordingly prioritized for targeted community-based assistance. Assistance included solar lighting in the settlements in conjunction with clearing of pathways and alternative shelter for families relocated to create space for lighting poles and the pathways. In addition to improving security and reducing protection incidents, the lighting initiative also allowed people to continue their small businesses at night and work from home and students to study after dark. Awareness programmes on prevention and response to SGBV and disability also benefited communities hosting IDPs with free psychosocial, medical and legal support. Small grants were also given to select local NGOs and civil society groups to expand Protection Monitoring and Population Movement Tracking networks across Somaliland. These received training and capacity-building, resulting in the build-up of a community protection cadre.

Land issues in Somaliland were problematic: difficulties were encountered in obtaining sufficient land to relocate or decongest IDP settlements due to clan-based land ownership. Xenophobic tensions and hostilities towards "foreigners" were common, often manifesting in verbal or physical attacks. The host community is Muslim and non-Muslims (mainly refugees, asylum-seekers and migrants from neighbouring Ethiopia) were particularly unwelcome and had difficulties finding accommodation and were blamed for all sorts of bad things such as crime, HIV/AIDs, prostitution and were considered by the locals as repugnant and thus inexistent in the Somali/Muslim community. To advocate for harmonious co-existence, UNHCR, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and UNDP brought together 200 traditional/clan leaders in a six day conference, the traditional leaders adopting a declaration to do away with harmful customs or traditions, resulting in an inter-community dialogue through which to jointly solve this problem. Gradually the dialogue expanded to resolving other community issues such as reporting crime, application of the rule of law and SGBV, contributing greatly to reducing tensions between the different groups.

Lessons Learned:

- Understanding the local context is very important. Conditions and ethnic compositions of communities vary from place to place – even within the same country - and it is important to devise programmes that take into account people's specific concerns in each community, and build up their coping mechanisms.
- Physical verification of beneficiaries was necessary in order to promote fairness among the different clans – especially to ensure inclusion of 'minority' clans (living in particularly poor conditions in separate settlements) who might otherwise have been omitted from the lists. This is always important for assistance projects in Somalia.
- The Protection approach was useful for expanding the skills pool of protection and population movement monitors and appreciated by the NGOs.
- The importance of creating inter-ethnic, inter-community dialogue was realized when community tensions were seen to reduce through increased dialogue. Host communities became more accepting of the displaced and agreed to contribute land for housing.
- 'Knowledge-based' assistance can be just as important as the provision of material goods in certain community-based interventions, promoting inter-community harmony and building local capacities for protection monitoring and community profiling while enhancing community awareness of human rights and the rule of law.

- Funding shortfalls can lead to reducing beneficiary numbers or reducing assistance goods and services. Programme planning to adequately address people's concerns becomes severely curtailed. This can only be addressed through frank dialogue with communities, encouraging them to prioritize the most vulnerable for relief assistance. Funding appeals in Somalia as a whole traditionally receive poor responses and the humanitarian community is limited in what it can achieve, leading to often scattered interventions. However, scarce funding promotes greater inter-cluster coordination in making resources go further.
- Vulnerability criteria should be commonly-agreed within the Protection Cluster and with individual communities. However, the degree and nature of vulnerability can vary between communities and the distinctions between chronic and extreme vulnerability need to be established according to individual contexts and communities.
- In contexts such as Somalia, where certain population groups have been exhaustively needs-assessed, new needs assessments can risk community hostility and reduced cooperation. The Protection Cluster relied on previous needs assessments to understand people's concerns and supplemented or triangulated this knowledge with focus group discussions with community leaders.
- Agency staffing components are important to consider: a mix of national staff representative of the different clans is necessary to avoid bias. This means that agencies can only operate effectively by not going below a minimum component of such staff.
- The number of host families assisted can be calculated by counting the number of plastic sheeting distributed. This is a useful – if rudimentary - monitoring and profiling tool.

c) Assistance to Individual Families

Cash-based assistance

EXAMPLE 1

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) has been experimenting with cash-based interventions to IDPs in host families for over a decade in Albania, Georgia, Indonesia, Ingushetia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Serbia, and others.²³ The types of projects funded by SDC are distinctive, reflecting its desire to add value and to undertake projects that other agencies are not doing.

Context: After the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami disaster, SDC decided to assist IDPs in host families in **Aceh, Indonesia**. The aim of the project was to prevent migration of the estimated 60-80% tsunami victims staying in host families to temporary / semi-permanent IDP camps ('baraks') as well as to support traditional hosting mechanisms.

Methodology: Assistance was cash-based and entailed what is a now institutionalized process in SDC²⁴:

- Performing an assessment mission immediately after the disaster, leading SDC to decide that direct assistance in cash to IDPs and host families in a heavily IDP hosted area would be the most effective way of using limited resources (US\$ 1 mio); the assessment included risk analysis to select districts for priority coverage;
- Signing MOU with local authorities in the districts selected;
- Obtaining lists from local authorities on the location of hosted IDPs;
- Verifying 10% of targeted beneficiaries in each community on the lists;
- Registering IDPs in host families;
- Arranging banking formalities with Bank Rakyat Indonesia (BRI) and opening individual accounts for beneficiaries;
- Distributing a one-time grant of US\$ 100 per IDP family in a host family through bank transfer. Distribution took place over a period of three months;
- Monitoring the distribution;
- Evaluating the impact of the cash donation;
- Communicating the aims and details of the programme to the wider community through messages posted at district and community offices, and dealing with complaints. Communication was made at each step of the operation.

In this example, only IDPs in host families were targeted. Districts were selected according to the criteria of security considerations based on the risk analysis, giving first priority to the municipality of Kota Banda Aceh and its periphery, and limited to those districts where local authorities were willing to cooperate and undertake registration jointly with SDC. Beneficiary lists were provided by the authorities and community leaders. The programme reached approximately 7,500 families or 85,000 individuals – indicating a family size of about 11 persons, compared to the national average of 5 persons per family.

Results:²⁵

- The success of the programme was considered largely due to both the intensive assessment and communications initiatives which explained to the population the aims of the programme and promoted community acceptance.

²³ For details of individual projects, see: http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/Experiences/SDC_Cash_Transfer_Projects

²⁴ SDC provides guidance, with examples, on each step of a cash transfer project in its Cash Workbook Toolbox: http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/SDC_Cash_Workbook/Toolbox_Cash_Workbook

²⁵ *Experiences with Cash-based approaches at Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation*: www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/document.php?itemID=1779...1

- The programme was effective: abuse of cash was not an issue; it empowered and gave choice to recipients, supported individual coping strategies, created a positive economic impact on the community and improved the livelihoods of beneficiaries.
- Complaints mechanisms allowed for missed beneficiaries to be included.
- IDPs shared the money with their hosts in the purchase of needed domestic items and food.
- Intensive assessments and registration were time-consuming, delaying the project, with the result that some of the IDPs may have exhausted their hosts' resources and felt compelled to move to an IDP centre before receiving their benefits. This, however, was not documented and remains speculation. The agency believes that there is no way to short-circuit these steps. Repeated communications can provide reassurance of coming assistance to help anchor the IDPs.
- Strong data management and community training were considered essential aspects of the programme.

EXAMPLE 2

Context: In post-tsunami **Sri Lanka**, the Swiss NGO Helvetas implemented in 2005 a 'cash for host families' project to help cover expenses associated with hosting.²⁶ The project targeted all families hosting two or more IDPs in their homes in eight of the affected divisions in Ampara district. The choice of divisions was made according to their 'priority rating' by the Government of Sri Lanka, where about 21,000 families – or 25% of the total number of IDPs – were estimated to be living with host families.²⁷

Methodology: Helvetas identified, registered and verified about 4,500 host families (HF) hosting about 5,200 guest families (GF), of whom some 60% were found to be living in the host family's house and 40% in temporary shelters on or close to the compound of the host family. The project was implemented with the collaboration and coordination of district, division and village authorities and followed broadly the same steps as the SDC Aceh programme above, with some variations: a public information campaign called for eligible families to fill out an application via a community-based registration committee, verification carried out by an independent body – in this case, the Human Rights Commission, a grievance redress procedure by a community-based committee, and payments were done in instalments for a total amount of US\$ 200 each, over a period of six months (June–November 2005), through bank transfer to host families' bank accounts at the People's Bank. The amount of cash received by the host families was the same for everyone – there was no differentiation according to income levels. Transparency and accountability were a priority. The impact of the programme was monitored through the local NGO Sewalanka.

Results: According to impact monitoring, the host family used 46% of the cash to pay utility bills and 32% was shared with the guest family, who used it for debt repayment, food, savings, etc. 57% of the men had a say in how the money should be used compared to 41% women. Most families – hosts and guests – were satisfied with the design and implementation of the project. Ultimately, guest family incomes increased after the tsunami to a level higher than that of the host families, due to various compensation packages received from the Government and private sources.

²⁶ Much of the material in this example is drawn from the minutes of a Host Family Meeting in Sri Lanka, 11 October 2005. [http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/srilanka/catalogue/Files/Coordination/Meeting%20 Minutes/MM43_Host%20Family%20Meeting%20-%202011%20Oct%202005.pdf](http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/srilanka/catalogue/Files/Coordination/Meeting%20Minutes/MM43_Host%20Family%20Meeting%20-%202011%20Oct%202005.pdf)

²⁷ This calculation was made by subtracting the number of IDPs in transitional shelters from the total estimated number of IDPs. Other estimates put the number of IDPs with host families at 16% of the total displaced.

Lessons learned:

- **Appropriate timing:** Whereas Helvetas acknowledged that the initiative was appropriate at the time and helped the IDPs and host families to cope in the immediate disaster aftermath, it decided that, more than nine months later, a different approach was needed geared towards supporting livelihoods. Subsequently, as a follow-up intervention of the CfHF-Project, the agency designed and implemented a Cash for Livelihood Restoration Project. Other agencies who had delayed decisions to assist host families were asked by the GoSL to focus their support on repair and reconstruction of permanent houses instead.
- **Culture:** Peer review of the Helvetas project considered that, given the country's strong tradition of family ties and family self-help, cash-for-host-family projects on the Helvetas model risk damaging this culture by creating dependency and raising future expectations. Many other tsunami-affected families had been living with their relatives without any assistance and the government in particular preferred assistance to come in the form of livelihoods projects. Henceforth, agencies agreed at that point in time to continue their support through housing reconstruction and targeted livelihoods support to IDPs – including through cash transfers.

EXAMPLE 3

Context: Post-election violence in **Kenya**, in December 2007, led to the large-scale destruction of property and the displacement of an estimated 250,000-300,000 people throughout the country.²⁸ Houses and livelihoods were burned down or looted and families had to abandon their homes for camps and urban centres, or took refuge with family or friends. Although already vulnerable themselves, the host population accommodated and supported the displaced, increasing the pressure on their own resources and assets. Based on the results of its food security and livelihoods assessment carried out in April 2008, ACF-USA decided to assist IDPs and host communities with a cash-based intervention to support the immediate and longer-term livelihood needs of IDPs and host communities in Nakuru Town to alleviate the pressure on resources. The selection of direct cash transfers as a delivery mechanism was made based on the presence of easily accessible and functioning markets and the availability of credible financial institutions.

Methodology: The six month ECHO-funded programme targeted 1,000 IDP and host community households in slum areas of Nakuru Town. Implementation was facilitated through collaboration with CSOs and the Ministry of Youth and Sport. Programme participants benefited individually or as pre-existing groups; others took the opportunity to organize new groups and open group accounts. A baseline survey was conducted after the targeting process was completed to assess the economic situation of targeted households, enabling later data comparisons. Beneficiary and community sensitization ensured transparency and understanding of the programme and its conditions.

Although various different transfer systems were considered, including direct distribution by ACF, Equity Bank of Kenya (EB) was chosen because of the ease and accuracy of monitoring through the bank's system, its transparency and accountability and the potential sustainability and longer-term impact encouraged by its micro-finance and savings policy. The security of agency staff was also a consideration. A joint ACF-US and EB team visited the slum programme areas to facilitate the opening of bank accounts for the 80% of targeted households that did not have them.

The money – €100 per beneficiary household – was transferred in two instalments: 20% for immediate needs and 80% intended to support livelihood recovery and investment. The bank, using a simple list of beneficiary names and matching bank account numbers, transferred the money

²⁸ *Making cash work: A case study from Kenya*, ACF-USA, reproduced in ODI's Humanitarian Exchange Magazine, issue 43, June 2009. <http://www.odihpn.org/report.asp?id=3015>. Excerpts from this report are reproduced here as an example of a good practice and lessons learned.

within three hours. After the first disbursement, in October 2008, post-distribution monitoring assessed the extent of any misuse (spending on alcohol, drugs or prostitution, for instance), or failure to respect the programme's rules and procedures. Based on the results, 114 households were expelled from the programme and replaced with new beneficiaries. All households, including the new ones, received the second disbursement. Beneficiaries were trained in business management, book-keeping and investment. A second round of post-distribution monitoring was conducted in December 2008 to determine household expenditure patterns and priorities, along with an internal evaluation of the programme as a whole.

Results:

- Post-distribution monitoring revealed that eighty percent of the beneficiaries were women. A quarter of households reported spending the first instalment on immediate needs while 47% used it for both immediate and longer-term needs. After the second distribution, all but 1% of households spent their cash on longer-term livelihoods investments; 3% of households saved some of the cash from the first distribution.
- Overall, 54% of households reported that they saved a portion of the transferred cash, with an average of €24 (2,412 KSh) saved per household. Reasons for saving included meeting future needs, business recovery and investment, and fears that the security situation could deteriorate again. Having a secure place to put money encouraged people to save. The high percentage of cash saved suggests that even people emerging from crisis are not simply interested in meeting immediate needs but are also willing to invest in the future. Albeit on a small scale, this cash transfer programme operated as a safety net in meeting needs as well as enabling people to prepare themselves in the event of future shocks.
- The programme enabled beneficiaries to participate in, and be recognized by, the formal banking system. Beneficiaries appreciated the transparency of the programme modalities, especially given the high levels of mistrust that persisted in the host community after the election violence. Despite the inherent security risks associated with working in urban slum areas, the programme succeeded in reaching its target households through the EB, whereas the direct distribution of cash or vouchers would have posed a greater security risk to ACF-USA programme team and to beneficiaries, who would have had to keep the cash in their homes or shelters.
- Using cash – and a bank to transfer it – instead of having to purchase, transport, store and distribute goods significantly increased the cost-efficiency of the programme.
- Total programme costs per beneficiary amounted to €145.43 per participant, of which 68.76% (€100) was the cash transfer itself, and 31.24% support costs. The relatively high support costs (mainly on human resources) were necessary to ensure adequate mobilisation, monitoring and analysis.

Lessons learned:

- The importance of community mobilization and monitoring in cash transfer programmes should be recognized, requiring the sufficient allocation of human, logistical and financial resources. Getting to know the affected communities and interacting with them is essential to ensure that the intervention is appropriate. Intensive monitoring provided timely and accurate information on programme outcomes. Implementing this programme within a short time-frame (six months) was a challenge, as there was limited time for monitoring and training. More time should be allocated after the last distribution (at least six months) to ensure follow-up and support, as well as a return calculation and impact evaluation.

- *When* a programme is implemented is as important as *what* the programme does. It was initially thought that the programme had started too late (six months after the initial violence) to respond to immediate needs and facilitate rehabilitation and the rapid recovery of livelihoods. However, the majority of programme participants confirmed that, had the programme started earlier than it did, they would have been unable to take full advantage of the opportunity it presented: many were still reeling from the initial shock of the violence and were not ready to think about and plan for the future. By August, when the targeting process started, people were ready to begin rebuilding their lives.
- The Nakuru cash programme clearly demonstrates that it is possible to implement emergency cash transfer programmes even in densely populated and insecure urban areas. Working closely with local structures facilitated access to the host community and the affected population, and supported targeting and follow-up. Close collaboration with EB enhanced the sustainability and continuity of activities through future access to micro-finance and credit after the end of the programme.
- The positive psychosocial impact of direct cash transfers, whereby families and individuals are able to decide their own priorities for spending and investment, should not be underestimated. Although the timeliness of livelihood rehabilitation responses by NGOs and donors is important, sooner is not always better. Allowing communities to identify the right point at which specific interventions should begin will improve effectiveness as well as sustainability.²⁹

Non-cash based assistance

EXAMPLE 1

Context: In **Lebanon**, in the aftermath of conflict with Israel in 2006/07, CARE International assisted vulnerable families in IDP return areas. The intention had been to assist the IDPs during displacement, but when hostilities ended a mass return movement took place virtually overnight and a rapid adjustment had to be made to the planning.

Methodology: Communities in return areas were asked to draw up vulnerability criteria and provide beneficiary lists. Criteria included pregnant and lactating women, the elderly, infirm and disabled. No verification was possible due to insecurity preventing access by international actors. Leakage was therefore seen as a distinct possibility. The nature of the contribution was fresh food provided in three distributions over the course of two months, and some NFIs. IDPs in host families in return areas were not directly targeted but many host families fell under the overall vulnerability criteria and became beneficiaries. Furthermore, nearly every household with an intact house in the (predominantly rural) return areas became a host family so assistance reached this group overwhelmingly. CARE considered that to select IDPs in host families specifically would have been inappropriate since all those in the return communities had been equally affected and traumatised from loss of relatives and friends.

²⁹ An evaluation of PEV cash programmes was undertaken by ECHO: *Lessons Learned from the Post-Election Violence Early Recovery Programme in Kenya, 2008-2009*. Nigel Nicholson, August 2009. [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2009.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/SKEA-7XUDSD-full_report.pdf/\\$File/full_report.pdf](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2009.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/SKEA-7XUDSD-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf). The evaluation validates the approach and implementation of ACF-US.

EXAMPLE 2

Context: In Tunisia, during the 2011 'Arab uprising' in Libya, approximately 60,000 Libyans fled the conflict in the Nafusa Mountains area and took refuge with families in southern Tunisia with whom they had traditional Berber ties. The scale and speed of the exodus put tremendous strains on the host communities whose water and livelihood resources in a desert area were already over-stretched by growing urbanization. The Arab diaspora - groups of Libyans and other people of Arab descent living in the West and flying back and forth to Northern Africa with whatever resources they had - were instrumental in assisting the refugees as they came across the border, bringing them food and non-food packages. However, the nature of this response, while spontaneous and generous, was sporadic and unsystematic and assisted only the refugees, not their hosts. UNHCR designed an innovative programme to assist the host families while simultaneously providing, with WFP and the diaspora groups, food and non-food items to the refugees themselves. The rationale of the programme was to anchor the refugees in the host families, since the existing camp capacity was too low and most families did not want to go to them, and to assist the host families cope with the stresses of providing for an additional 4 - 20 people.

Methodology: 'Les Comités de la Révolution' in each of the six most affected Governorates put out an appeal for Tunisian families to come forward with hosting offers, enabling them to direct refugees arriving at the border to find placements within host families. With the help of the Tunisian Red Crescent Society, which had lists of the refugees and their hosts, UNHCR, WFP and ICC conducted joint needs assessments which showed that the highest cost burden to the host families was their electricity and water bills. UNHCR decided that the best assistance it could provide to the host families would be a contribution to their utility bills. The Tunisian water and electricity authorities gave a breakdown of utility costs in the average household, allowing UNHCR to calculate a contribution. Radio broadcasts through the local governorates invited the host families to bring their bills to a stipulated address, whereby UNHCR verified the families and their bills according to host family registration lists and authorized payment of up to TND 100 (about \$75) for both bills covering two months, representing about 80% of their expenditure. If the amounts payable were less than TND 100, the full bill was reimbursed. The programme covered four months of expenditure, with credit lines opened with the utility companies if the families had already paid. The programme cost to UNHCR was \$600,000 and covered about 8,000 host families (not all of them applied for the assistance).

Results: The assistance was much appreciated by the host families, according to random post-distribution monitoring. The indirect method of payment meant they felt they were not receiving handouts, thus retaining their dignity in hosting. The refugees also felt relieved that the burden they were imposing on their hosts could be mitigated by this support mechanism.

Lessons learned:

- UNHCR lost a month searching for a methodology to make payments to the host families given that payments cannot be made to non-refugees. The way round this was to have each refugee family linked to their Tunisian hosts through a refugee phone number or house visit. The payments were possible this way by having the refugees and their hosts linked as a single unit by means of a 'fiche de contrôle' for verification and monitoring (to ensure the refugee was actually staying with the host). However, time lost in setting up the programme meant that some Libyan families left their hosts, feeling that they were too much of a burden, and went to stay in camps or returned to unsafe conditions in Libya.
- Although the methodology demanded heavy staff resources of UNHCR and its partners for registration and verification, the combined staff resources (and attendant costs) were significantly less than the over 500 employees needed to run just one refugee camp of 7,000 people. Host families can thus be considered a cost-effective means of assistance and protection.
- The mechanism is useful both for refugees and IDPs.

COMBINATION OF CASH AND NON-CASH ASSISTANCE

Context: In the **Philippines**, the NGO ‘Community and Family Services International’ (CFSI) partnered with UNHCR to respond to the 2009 typhoon ‘Ketsana’ disaster. In addition to damaging social infrastructure and livelihoods among the poorest communities in Metro Manila and its peripheries, the three typhoons displaced record numbers of people. Flood-related landslides displaced many more in Northern Luzon communities.³⁰

Methodology: The UNHCR/CFSI disaster response programme was part of a four-pronged disaster response that included (i) protection advocacy to local and national government officials, CSOs and community representatives; (ii) a Participatory Protection Assessment (PPA) which identified the most vulnerable individuals and families through community-based assessments; (iii) QIPs to disaster-affected communities and (iv) assistance to people with special needs. IDPs in host families were not specifically targeted as beneficiaries, but upon registration it became clear that many of those registered were IDPs in host families or the host families themselves. Inclusion criteria were drawn up in conjunction with local communities, CFSI and UNHCR, who decided to provide targeted assistance to communities in N. Luzon through QIPS and to especially vulnerable individuals in two municipalities in Metro Manila: replacement of assets to people with disabilities who had lost their wheelchairs, canes, spectacles etc. in the floods; cash assistance to pregnant and lactating mothers; education assistance to children who had become orphaned in the disaster; medical assistance to those with chronic illness such as diabetes and to victims of SGBV. These were measures proposed directly by the community as a result of the PPA.

In a related intervention, CFSI partnered with WFP to provide food and cash for work (CFW) for disaster-affected families, many of whom also transpired as hosts or IDPs in host families. Beneficiaries were selected by the national Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and verified by CFSI.

Lessons learned:

- The PPA was a relatively new tool that UNHCR decided to pilot in the disaster-response programme. It proved its efficacy in the ‘community support’ culture of the Philippines, where relationships between everyone in the community are particularly close-knit and where small-scale and localized community-based support initiatives are part of the self-help culture – particularly in very poor urban slum areas. The families selected for inclusion in the initiative were accepted by non-beneficiaries because the community itself was so closely involved in every step of the programme. About 50% of the beneficiaries were being hosted or host families themselves.
- The programmes took place in a pre-election context where local politicians were eager to take credit for assistance provided by international agencies. CFSI had to tread carefully to detect bias in DSWD beneficiary lists padded with pro-government supporters, and to remove party flags placed over food packages provided by WFP. This underscores the importance of context in assistance programmes, whether host family related or not. The UNHCR/CFSI assistance to vulnerable individuals did not suffer from the same attempted aid-diversionary tactics because it was the communities who selected the beneficiaries, not the government.
- Targeting abuse was detected in the verification process. This reinforces the importance of close verification and monitoring.

³⁰ The landslides in Northern Luzon were largely due to development-related activities: heavy mining in the province which had denuded large swathes of previously forested areas.

d) Examples of other issues of importance

1. Assessments:

A key tenet of assistance interventions for host families and host communities is that of multi-sectoral assessments. These are a necessary pre-cursor to an assistance programme. The multi-sectoral character of an assessment is important in order to capture the full picture of a humanitarian situation that might be missed with a single-sector assessment. For example, a food security assessment may miss shelter or WASH needs, and result in a food-based intervention that is not the most appropriate to the situation. Multi-sectoral assessments can detect which needs are greatest and recommend follow up in those sectors for maximum impact.

The following is an example of an assessment carried out by Oxfam in Lubero territory (**N. Kivu, DRC**) in 2009.³¹

The agency trained multi-sectoral assessment teams who travelled to various sites, spending a week in each, and used a combination of household surveys, based on questionnaires, and focus group discussions to gather data. This was simultaneously compared with other sources – mainly other INGOs working in the areas and local population movement committees. Two communities were assessed: one from which people were fleeing (Zone A) and the other to which the majority of those fled (Zone B) – both zones having traditional ties.

The assessment took into account aspects of the humanitarian situation concerning public health, food security and livelihoods. Technical details were produced in two reports (covering the two areas addressed) and detailed recommendations were provided for follow-up action. The headings under the two reports covered: main diseases and epidemics, the functioning of primary health care systems, main pathologies reported by the health clinics (including sexual violence), water quantity and quality, sanitation, access to food, household income sources, average household food basket sources, access to land, seasonal activity impact, and access to markets.

Lessons learned:

- The usefulness of the assessment model: Oxfam considered it a ‘reasonably robust tool for identifying areas of potentially acute humanitarian need’ but that it was ‘specific to the area assessed and its environs and any attempt to apply it to other regions would represent an extrapolation’. It was seen to represent a ‘reasonable conceptual framework for developing contingency plans and more effective monitoring and evaluation methodologies’.
- The cluster system and its decision-making: it was recommended that Clusters must take into account protection and livelihoods indicators when assessing the needs of humanitarian needs associated with military (or para-military) operations. Also, active surveillance methods (nutritional screening, independent human rights monitoring) should be incorporated into monitoring structures.
- Assistance interventions recommended: Food aid to be targeted to both host and IDP populations in Zone B. The latter recommendation was made in order to relieve the food-sharing burden of host communities in Zone B, the IDPs having no consistent means of supporting themselves and their reliance on the over-stretched host communities for food. Water provision systems particular to the area (this is Oxfam’s area of expertise) alongside provision of water containers for water collection and household storage, and related hygiene NFIs.

³¹ OXFAM GB *Multi-Sector Assessment: Lubero Territory, April-May 2009, General Report*. Oxfam

- Post-distribution monitoring: the assessment considered this as an essential precursor for evaluating the effectiveness of food and NFI distributions and monitoring the evolution of the humanitarian situation.

Following the assessment recommendations Oxfam GB initiated an assistance programme designed to avoid further displacement and to support return when feasible. This resulted from the finding that IDPs find return easier from host families than from camps since they are closer to, and retain greater contact with their home areas. The programme consisted of a WASH intervention to alleviate the situation of the host community as well as provision of WASH-related NFIs to individual families. In a related effort to support the host communities, UNICEF set up emergency schooling facilities to alleviate the pressure on host community schools brought about by the increase in IDP children.

2. Statistics and Sizing:

A constant challenge faced by the humanitarian community is to obtain and monitor statistics on host families and hosted IDPs. To date there has been no systematic attempt to quantify the scope of the phenomenon. Oxfam DRC epitomizes the challenges of establishing exact numbers or household sizes worldwide:

- IDPs are dispersed amongst the host communities rather than in camp situations;
- Arrivals of new IDPs may coincide with the return of people who have previously been displaced from those areas.
- High mobility of IDPs: in many situations they are moving in and out of host families, seeking to spare their hosts the burden of their need for refuge and driven by hopes of better security or employment opportunities elsewhere, or returning periodically to their home areas to check on their properties and cultivate their fields.
- The ratio between the numbers of IDPs and host families is difficult to estimate. It is common in some situations, particularly in African ‘solidarity families’, to find more than one family unit of IDPs staying with a single host. This poses problems when ‘sizing’ potential beneficiary numbers through extrapolation.
- Security and access constraints may prevent attempts to quantify a hosting community.

Given these challenges, humanitarian actors are coming to realize the effectiveness of community outreach workers and community leaders in providing data on IDPs and host families. As residents of the community they have a day-to-day appreciation of who is arriving and leaving and with whom they are staying. While they may not maintain regular statistics, they can be prevailed upon to do so, with support and capacity-building from agencies. UNHCR’s experiences in Somaliland and Haiti have recognized this potential.

ANNEX D:

Manuals and guidance materials

The UNHCR Tool for Participatory Assessment in Operations

<http://www.unhcr.org/publ/PUBL/450e963f2.html>

The Heightened Risk Identification Tool User Guide, UNHCR

<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/teaxis/vtx/refworld/rwmain?docid=46f7c0cd2>

IASC Guidance on Profiling Internally Displaced Persons, IDMC-OCHA, 2008,

<http://www.internal-displacement.org>

Internal Displacement Profiling Toolbox, Danish Refugee Council, 2008.

[http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CFA06/\(httpKeyDocumentsByCategory\)/B3898C325EEBCF24C12574CE00317D2D/\\$file/DRC%20-%20IDP%20Profiling%20Toolbox_final%20April%202008.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CFA06/(httpKeyDocumentsByCategory)/B3898C325EEBCF24C12574CE00317D2D/$file/DRC%20-%20IDP%20Profiling%20Toolbox_final%20April%202008.pdf)

The Shelter Cluster Technical Working Group in Haiti, 2010:

<https://sites.google.com/site/shelterhaiti2010/technical-info/twig-1/host>

The site provides guidelines and samples such as:

- Host Community Guidelines : Supporting Host Families in Haiti by Tracking Movements, Understanding Needs and Directing Responses
- Host Families Shelter Response Guidelines,
- Host Family and Community Needs Assessment Guidelines,
- Host Family Beneficiary Selection Form,
- Assessment Form for Host Families (in French)
- Rapid Assessments with Host Families/IDPs,
- Haitian Red Cross/IFRC Formulaire d'évaluation pour le programme d'assistance aux familles d'accueil (in French),
- Host Family Programming Matrix

Guide for Cash Transfer Programming in Emergencies, Oxfam GB,

http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/resources/downloads/Cash%20Transfers/ct_20.pdf

Guidelines for cash transfer programming, IFRC,

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/pubs/disasters/cash-guidelines-en.pdf>

Cash for Host Families (CfHF) Aceh, Draft Project Outline, SDC, 2005,

http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/...Cash...project.../2.1_%20Project%20Document_Aceh%202005.doc

SDC Cash Workbook: A practical user's guide for the preparation and implementation of Cash Projects, SDC, 2007 http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/SDC_Cash_Workbook

The SDC Cash Workbook Toolbox uses samples from its cash transfer experiences, including cash for host families. These provide templates, concepts, guidance documents, checklists, etc. on issues that will normally need to be covered in host family-related projects:

Project identification, project definition, preparation of project documents, planning and conducting assessment missions, beneficiary criteria and appropriate sizing of cash contributions, risk analysis, security assessments, project planning and scheduling, public relations and announcements, registration and verification, payments, complaints, monitoring and evaluation, office set-up and administration, database setup and management and office closure. http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/en/Home/SDC_Cash_Workbook/Toolbox_Cash_Workbook

IFRC Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment – VCA

<http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/pubs/disasters/resources/preparing-disasters/vca/whats-vca-en.pdf>

Urban Profiling – IDMC – Feinstein Centre, Tufts University,

[http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/12E8C7224C2A6A9EC125763900315AD4/\\$file/monitoring-disaster-displacement.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/12E8C7224C2A6A9EC125763900315AD4/$file/monitoring-disaster-displacement.pdf)

Cash for Host Families (CfHF) Aceh, Draft Project Outline, SDC, 2005,

http://www.sdc-cashprojects.ch/...Cash...project.../2.1_%20Project%20Document_Aceh%202005.doc

ANNEX E: Sample verification form

Cash for HostFamilies CfHF Aceh 2005	 Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Implementing Phase Verification Form 19.03.2005 / HHE
--	--	--

Regency:	District:	Village:
		Date: _____
		Time start interview: _____
		Time end interview: _____
A Host Family		
Name of Host:		SDC CfHF Code:
1	House not found: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
2	Nobody present: <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Head of HF present: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	4 Comes back at: _____
5	If no Head of HF, other representative of HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	6 Who: <input type="checkbox"/> wife <input type="checkbox"/> relative
7	Name of interviewed person (HF): _____	
8	ID/KTP Number (HF): _____	
9	Address: _____	
B General Information		
10	Have you been hosting IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
11	Beginning of hosting IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> December <input type="checkbox"/> January <input type="checkbox"/> February <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
12	IDPs living now in same house with HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	13 How many IDPs: _____ Persons
14	IDPs living now in another house of HF: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	15 How many IDPs: _____ Persons
16	IDPs has left the HF <input type="checkbox"/> no	
	<input type="checkbox"/> yes 17 Date of departure: _____	How many: _____
	18 To where: <input type="checkbox"/> barracks <input type="checkbox"/> own house <input type="checkbox"/> other	
		<input type="checkbox"/> camps <input type="checkbox"/> other HF <input type="checkbox"/> do not know
C IDPs		
19	Head of IDPs present: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	20 Reason of absence: _____
21	If no Head of IDPs, other representative of IDPs: <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	22 Who: <input type="checkbox"/> wife <input type="checkbox"/> relative
23	Name of interviewed person (IDP): _____	
24	ID/KTP Number (IDP): _____	
25	Number of IDPs living in the house with HF: _____ Persons (IDPs)	
Signature HF: _____		Signature Team Leader: _____
Signature IDP: _____		

SDC Office contact number: Ruri 0812 694 5400

Checking Verification	1. Criteria (KTP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted
	2. Criteria (IDPs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	PM Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected
	3. Criteria (period)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ok	<input type="checkbox"/> Diff	<input type="checkbox"/> Miss	<input type="checkbox"/> Doubtful

ANNEX F:

Assistance to idps in Host Families and Host Communities: Checklist, Modalities and Advice for Unstable Situations

I. General

- Keep adequate attention to context:
 - What are the reasons for displacement?
 - Why are IDPs in host families?
 - What are the relationships between IDPs and host families, and the patterns of hosting (family, relatives, other IDP families; are IDP families split; if yes, where is the rest of the family and why)?
 - What is the geographical distance between the place of origin and the place of displacement?
 - What are the relationships between IDPs and host families, taking into account cultural and ethnic factors?
 - What is the strength of civil society?
 - Is there assistance? Which kind?
 - What are the available partners and their capacity?
- Base project design on multi-sector participatory needs assessment, including the following information:
 - How many people are displaced and where?
 - Is assistance needed?
 - If yes, which kind?
 - What are the intentions of IDP families in the short / medium term?
- Maintain adequate balance between good preparation and speed of programme implementation – speed is essential in emergencies.
- Ensure community participation in beneficiary selection and design.
- Choose the right intervention options, taking into account the possibility of cash options.
- Use clear and commonly-developed beneficiary selection criteria, based on vulnerability.
- Regularly verify beneficiary lists prepared by community/partners.
- Monitor regularly.
- Keep contact with beneficiaries.
- Maintain transparency and accountability with the community, including selection criteria.

II. Recommended Modalities

Further explanations and criteria	ASSISTANCE MODALITIES		
	1. Assistance to individual families (IDP and host community)	2. Assistance to host communities	3. Combination of both models
Definitions, comments and criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two modalities: cash based and non-cash based. Can also be mixed. • Based on simple, commonly agreed vulnerability criteria. However, urgency may require blanket distribution. • Good for emergencies with little time to assess needs and design project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance that creates a general benefit to the whole community. Strengthens absorption capacity and reduces tensions. • Two modalities: social infrastructure; centres to deliver particular services. • Good for protracted situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most widely used. • Frequently developed as an evolution of the first model. • Good for situations that may be evolving from emergency to protracted.
Field Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cash-based: In Aceh, local authorities prepared lists, agency verified 10% of beneficiaries and gave 100% to each IDP family through bank transfer • Non-cash based: In Kenya, UNHCR visited neighbourhoods upon community request, verified vulnerability, registered families and distributed NFIs on the spot, both IDP and from host community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Serbia, municipalities identified prioritized interventions and budgets and signed MOUs with international agency. • In Somaliland, a legal clinic was established to assist IDPs and host populations alike. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Yemen, assistance (food and NFIs) was given to host families, IDPs and other families in host communities on criteria of family size, income and home conditions. At the same time, water and sanitation was improved in the neighbourhoods.

III. Advice for Unstable Situations and Those with Limited Access

ADVISABLE:

- Distribute blanket assistance to affected populations, or
- Where possible, define simple and commonly agreed vulnerability criteria and target assistance to the most vulnerable, of whom some may be IDPs in host families or host communities.
- Distribute food, NFIs including shelter materials and hygiene kits.

INADVISABLE:

- Singling out IDPs for assistance,
- Establishing a new IDP delivery platform model when one exists,
- Defining vulnerability criteria when time and urgency does not allow for proper targeting, verification and registration, in which case blanket assistance is necessary.