



1. Introduction

This report summarizes the findings on a series of Focus Group Discussions (FGD) held with the Host community, in order to both facilitate the engagement with the community and provide an initial first approach on their current needs and issues, and their overall perception on the eventual relocation/resettlement IDP community in their vicinity.

2. Methodology

The Focus Group Discussions were divided into 4 distinct demographic groups: Women (19-50), Men (19-50), Youth (12-18) and Elderly (60+), and conducted on the location of Ngalane, very close to the area of Metuge where the IDP communities are planned to be relocated/resettled eventually. Persons with Disabilities were also represented in some of the groups.

The FGD questionnaire had a multi-sectorial needs approach, focusing as well on their overall feeling towards the arrival of the IDPs and their perception on the solutions and support that such situation might require in order for both communities (the IDP and the Host) to better integrate.

3. Host Needs Assessment

For the needs assessment, an analytical framework inspired in the MIRA one has been used to classify the information collected from the hosts during the FGD exercises:

		Description
Scope and Scale	Drivers/Aggravating Factors	Factors that can trigger or expose to suffering conditions. These aggravating factors are contextual elements that exacerbate the crisis.
	System Disruption	Information about systems and networks that cease to function and impact service delivery or availability and quality of services and goods (in this case related to disruption in their places of origin)
Humanitarian conditions	Access to basic services	Information related to access, availability, awareness, use and quality of basic/essential goods and services
	Impact on physical and mental wellbeing	Secondary effects resulting from first level outcomes and affecting directly the physical and mental health of the affected population
	Risk/Vulnerabilities	Situations that could potentially deteriorate and increase first and second level outcomes if the needs are not met
	Specific Needs	Information related to services access for People with Special Needs (this includes Persons with Disability and might include elderly people or population with pre-existing conditions)
Capacity and Response	Coping mechanisms	Strategies or activities adopted using available skills and resources, to manage adverse conditions
	Response	Combination of strengths and resources within the community, society, government or national/international organizations being used to respond to a crisis
	Systems Functionality	Capacity of existing local or national systems to operate and provide affected population with essential goods and services



The different qualitative information on needs provided by the IDPs is tagged according to this framework and evaluated according to a simple rating scale (0 = No problem, 1 = minor problem, 2 = Situation of concern, 3 = Serious/critical situation). This facilitates the task of aggregating those pieces of related information from each sector and summarizing the findings under a general perceived severity cross-score for each sector and component.

A higher score towards 3 should be read as that component reported or perceived negatively, lack of resources or as a potential trigger for crisis-worsening. A high score translates as a high number of severely or concerning issues reported under that component. Please note that this score should be seen only as a very preliminary evaluation, as it is not coming from a systematic assessment. FGD information can suffer from bias both coming from the own nature of the FGD dynamics itself, but also bias introduced by the evaluation team when rating the information provided.

Notice that the sectors the Host population identifies as more demanding are their shelter situation (in relation to building materials and infrastructure), the health services (it was repeatedly reported a relatively big distance of several km to the closest hospital/health centre), and the WASH situation (though they have access to clean water, it consists only of a single source which they fear might not be sufficient).

	Shelter	Food	WASH	Health	Education	Economic/Livelihood	Protection
Drivers/ Aggravating Factors	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.5		2.5	1.6
System Disruption			3		2		0.5
Access to basic services or goods	2.2	0.9	2.2	1.5	1.8	1.3	0.5
Impact on physical and mental wellbeing	2.5	1.3	2.8	1.3	2	1.7	2
Risks/Vulnerabilities	2.5	1.3	2.3	1.5	1.7	1.2	2
Specific Needs		2	2	1.7		1	0
Coping Mechanisms		1.3	2			1	0
Response (National/NGO/INGO)	3		3	1.5			3
Systems Functionality	3	0	2.4	2	2	0	1.7

The following matrix highlights some the most severely reported issues and situations under each component, as compiled from the FGD transcripts.

	Shelter	Food	Wash	Health	Education	Economic/Livelihoods	Protection
Drivers/Aggravating Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roofing was identified as the most pressing need in the community Lack of electricity is a concern; residents use oil lamps, candles and torches for security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They consider that the arrival of IDPs can affect the access to food, as food availability is limited However, if the IDPs receive and the host community too, there will be an equilibrium and no one will have problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is not sufficient to all due to frequent issues in supply Water is available but far from the community They consider that to avoid problems related to water, the IDPs should have their own waterpoints and the host community theirs. When the latrines are full or for those who do not have it, it is necessary to go to resort to open air defecation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most common diseases are diarrhoea and malaria. No hospital in the area, only a local clinic nearby Malaria treatment is free The closest main hospital is in Namuapala (7km) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They consider that there will be some scarcity on the access to livelihoods when the IDPs arrive because they are going to use the same resources. They would like to have access to formal employment and complained that the few opportunities in the area are filled with people from outside, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding GVB, no major issues were reported. When is domestic violence, the communities do not involve on it Some adults do not have documents, yet no issues for lacking documentation was reported. Expressed initial concern on IDP population due to potential conflicts or distrust They feel safe in the area, only minor incidents reported related to farm animals being stolen
System Disruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water is not sufficient to all due to frequent issues in supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hospital in the area, only a local clinic nearby, where simple cases can be treated free of charge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools are closed and some children engage in labour activities in the fields, or selling activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some adults do not have documents,
Access to basic services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buckets are needed Roofing was identified as the most pressing need in the community Lack of electricity is a concern; residents use oil lamps, candles and torches for security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most important way to get food is through machambas (farmlands) Normally those who do not own a machamba work for someone who owns one. Another source is through small biscates (small business). Local subsistence farming is not sufficient to provide for all during the entire year, families purchase local to supplement. 	<p>Water is available but far from the community When the latrines are full or for those who do not have it, it is necessary to go to resort to open air defecation.</p>	<p>The closest main hospital is in Namuapala (7km)</p>	<p>The school is located 4 km away but no incidents with children were reported. Children are asked to present documentation and a period of 2 months is given for families to provide it; but no children was prevented from accessing education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women report that they would like to have more access to livelihoods, as most of them depend on their husband's money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some adults do not have documents, yet no issues for lacking documentation was reported.
Impact on physical and mental wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local subsistence farming is not sufficient to provide for all during the entire year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to Covid prevention measures, though not know the symptoms, they mentioned that washing the hands with soap or ashes and wearing facial masks are effective ways to prevent it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children miss going to school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reported fear of wrongdoers in Nangua, and that children could be kidnapped Expressed initial concern on IDP population due to potential source of conflict or distrust
Risk/Vulnerabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local subsistence farming is not sufficient to provide for all during the entire year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the latrines are full or for those who do not have it, it is necessary to go to resort to open air defecation. Access to water source is very close to main road and a potential factor for accidents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some adults do not have documents, yet no issues for lacking documentation was reported. Some concerns were raised with the arrivals of the IDPs to the village Proximity to the main road is a potential cause for accidents, as they need to cross it in order to access to water source Women and children are usually the ones bringing the water

Specific Needs	•	•	• Elderly and persons with disabilities struggle to access water because of the distance, some people help them in exchange of money.	• PWD lack of means of transport to the hospital in Namuapala (7km)			•
Coping mechanisms		• If they are really short on food, they sell firewood, grass for instance in the road.	• When the latrines are full or for those who do not have it, it is necessary to go to resort to open air defecation.	They practice washing the hands with soap or ashes and wearing facial masks to prevent Covid.		• Picking snails and hunting rats to sell in Pemba • A small number of them, also work taking care of animals owned by people that live outside the community • Women that work, they do it in the machambas and do some little jobs (selling firewood, grass and snails)	•
Response	• Lack of electricity is a concern; residents use oil lamps, candles and torches for security. • Roofing was identified as the most pressing need in the community	•		• They do not receive information on the different diseases nor on prevention			• Some adults do not have documents,
Systems Functionality		•		The closest main hospital is in Namuapala (7km)	The school is located 4 km away but no incidents with children were reported.	• Though village is small, there is space for everyone to cultivate their crops including the IDPs	• Some adults do not have documents, • They feel safe in the area, only minor incidents reported related to farm animals being stolen



4. Host Overall Feelings and Perception on IDPs

- The score rating tries to measure the 'perception' on several indicators. This score uses a scale 0 to 2 (0 – negative, 1 – neutral, 2 – positive) in order to evaluate the overall feeling of Host FGD responses under three areas:
 - Solutions / Needs support: Potential solutions or needs projections as expressed by the Host population as mechanisms to accommodate to the new situation
 - Response planning: What aspects they expect or wish that the response offered by the organizations (including government) should encompass
 - IDP perception:
- There were specific concerns on the presence of the newly arrived IDP population and their eventual relocation/resettlement in the area, and though some of these concerns were expressed under a negative perspective (specially in relation to the use of already struggling resource such as water access), there were also many others in which they understood the IDP situation and expressed a positive willingness in accepting and integrating the new population, and formulated positive remarks on how this could be achieved and/or what would they expect from the new population in order to facilitate the integration. This included aspects as joint participation in the governance of the community or potential economic input
- Most the Solutions and Response they would expect, were expressed under a positive perspective and this is reflected in the matrix score below. IDP perception still rates below the two other components, due to several negative concerns expressed on certain aspects, but still keeps a slight positive overall score.
- The 'perception' score is a conditional one and interrelated among indicators. Positiveness is expressed in function on several conditions they expect on Response and Solution/Needs support to be eventually addressed.



The following matrix highlights some of the most common reported issues and thoughts in relation to their Overall perception on the IDPs arrival, their integration, and the potential solutions and needs they would expect.

	Solutions / Needs support	Response planning	IDP Perception
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The women are open to create an association with the IDPs community to discuss and create/have a pacific coexistence. • They are open to a mixed leadership for the community, involving the IDP population • They express the need of clearly establishing an area which has no issues in relation to land property to avoid future conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main results of the arrival of IDPs would be materialized in better housing, schools, hospital, market and access to electricity. • They believe that Organizations could involve them • They could host some people in their family units • They agree that both populations should be informed on the relocation site and authorities should provide information 	<p>They are in favor that the IDPs are relocated to their community.</p> <p>In general, the conveyed message was that the IDPs will be welcome, as they expect that more development will be brought to the area and they it will be positive to them all and that it grows to become a bairro</p> <p>The main results of the arrival of IDPs would be materialized in better housing, schools, hospital, market and access to electricity.</p> <p>Youth report that they will have more friends and friends</p> <p>Some business could grow</p>
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water access mentioned as a potential source of conflict. They are concerned about it. 	<p>Authorities did not involve them</p>	<p>Concern because of food availability</p> <p>Concern because of access to single source of water</p> <p>Concern because of cultural differences as potential conflict and distrust driver</p>
Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They mentioned that services such as water, school and hospitals should be improved. • They reported no presence at all of UN/NGOs • It was mentioned that IDPs should have their machambas to work on the land. • They would like more water and energy sources be built • They mentioned that services such as water, school and hospitals should be improved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have concerns on the language barrier (not necessarily negative) • It was mentioned that IDPs should have their machambas to work on the land.