

PROTECTION MONITORING AT RELOCATION SITES

Location: Matadouro, Axel and Chota

Participants: UNHCR, UNFPA and IOM

Date: 06/04/2019

Preamble:

Relocation took place today, 06 April that was spearhead by INGC. This activity involved 60 households moving from Axel to IFP Inhamizua, 25 households moving from Chota to IFP Inhamizua and 50 households moving from Escola Primária Completa de Matadouro to San Pedro. It was later realised that an additional relocation of Approx. 20 individuals had taken place from Dondo to IFP Inhamizua.

It is worth noting that immense support was accorded by Directors of the schools in Chota and IFP Inhamizua who were fully involved in the process including briefing the IDP's and resolving arising issues. In addition, a lot of support was also given by the team of volunteers who guided IDPs to their respective tents including carrying luggage as well as ensuring that the children were not lost.

Relocation at Matadouro.

The population at Matadouro were to relocate to San Pedro. According to the population, they had been informed of the planned relocation three days in advance and also informed that it was voluntary. However, it was not clear to them about where they were relocating to.

Some families preferred to return home as long as they were issued with shelter kits to reconstruct their houses. A protection multi-functional team comprising of UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM and Save the children were on ground to monitor the process to ensure that protection issues were identified and potential risks mitigated.

Key findings:

1. It was discovered by the MFT team that the site they were to relocate to; San Pedro was not ready.
2. WASH facilities had not been completed. No CFS, TLS or demarcated cooking area.
3. The population had received 25 kgs of rice and 1 liter cooking oil.
4. Vaccination against cholera were on-going on site.
5. List had been prepared by classroom leaders of those intending to voluntarily relocate and those intending to stay.
6. At around 11:00a.m the activity was halted due to food distribution by **WFP?** As soon as the community heard about it, they stormed into the school demanding assistance as they felt that they were equally affected.
7. Relocation to the new site took place that evening after the agitated community had returned home.
8. At the site, there was no humanitarian actor present to receive the population, no manifests were used and INGC ensured that Escola Primária Completa de Matadouro was empty.

Relocation at Chota

The affected group at Chota was to relocate to IFP Inhamizua. A protection multi-functional team comprising of UNHCR, UNICEF and IOM were on ground to assess protection risks pre, during and after the relocation. Fortunately, INGC shared list of those intending to relocate and those requesting to remain behind. Child protection team enhanced the data shared to enable aggregation based on age cohorts and gender.

Key Findings:

1. The main concern of the population was that they lived in Chota for a long time and children studied in that school, they also engaged in small and medium-sized enterprises within Chota. The new site was very far, they stated that the move would interfere with both the school program and livelihood.
2. Those who choose to stay preferred to attain assistance to reconstruct their houses; plastic sheeting.
3. It was clear that persons with specific needs were not included during discussions as they lacked vital information regarding the move
4. Distribution was not done in Chota neither were hot meals served.
5. Amongst the population that arrived at IFP Inhamizua from Chota were 20 women, 38 children and 3 men. There is a need to assess if these are genuine Single Headed Households or their husbands had remained behind to secure the land allocation given to them by the government.

Relocation at Anex

The affected group at Anex was to relocate to IFP Inhamizua which is within the same compound. World vision was leading CP/Family unity with volunteers from UNFPA, IOM was coordinating logistical issues, while UNHCR and UNICEF were monitoring for possible protection incidents.

Key Findings:

1. Household registration was conducted and families escorted in batches to new sites
2. Children were still in school therefore World Vision set up a desk to share information on where their parents/caregivers had relocated to.
3. In total, 61 Households had relocated from Anex to IFP Inhamizua.

Main concerns:

1. While UNHCR was supposed to play only a protection monitoring role, it was not possible to standby and not get engaged. In two of the sites, IOM, UNICEF, World Vision and UNHCR were present, no other agencies, not even the INGC. UNHCR's presence was perceived as in its capacity as the UNHCR protection cluster.
2. INGC was also not available pre, during and after the relocation.
3. In some locations, the movement lacked accountability as manifests were not used.
4. Inadequate **information on the package** to be offered to people who opted not to relocate. It was not clear to the displaced nor to humanitarian community what the package was and as a result, necessary clarifications to the community members were not done which may have affected the discussion to move or not. The duration of stay in the camps is also not clear.
5. Intention to return survey was not conducted by INGC to better analyse the needs of the population and coping mechanisms of those who do not want to return. The voluntary nature of the movement is questionable. Many of the families are rather destitute and their homes were destroyed. It is clear that they cannot stay in the school structures, food is only distributed to the "sites" and not communities and therefore IDP's see no way to survive in the short term
6. The anxiety of being "listed" is affecting the surrounding community and many of them claimed to be affected and in need of support. This is a risk factor of abuse and exploitation of the system
7. It was clear that a reconnaissance was not conducted to estimate distance, needs if going by road and confirmation if sites were ready.
8. Besides Matodouro where the police had to be contacted to calm the agitated crowd, the other sites lacked security presence to ensure physical safety at all stages during and after their relocation including en-route and at the destination.
9. The new site at San Pendro has a swamp at the middle, this increase the risk of contracting malaria.
10. The population was transported using a dump track. With a high population being women and children, the tracks in use are totally inappropriate, too deep, too high for the transportation of women and children and the driver in one specific instance acted recklessly which could have

resulted in serious injuries to the mothers and their infants. It is clear that special attention had not been given to vulnerable groups including women, children during the relocation.

11. Some people live close to the schools where they were displaced to, and their children attend the same school. Relocation means their children will not attend school or if they do will be paying transport cost. They cannot continue to regular check on their property. Are there alternative options that could have been made to have a collective tent outside the school but nearer to their plots as long as the place is not flooded?
12. The departure timing was late in the day and yet staff had arrived at the accommodation centre in good time so a good portion of the day was wasted.
13. No arrangements on site to have health teams receiving and attending to individuals in need.
14. There were no arrangements for drinking water, or water for washing despite the existing threat of cholera.
15. UNFPA should be requested to provide dignity kits to the IDPs as part of their arrival package.

Suggested follow up:

1. UNHCR to consider using this opportunity to distribute some critical items e.g. sleeping mats, pots & pans and lumps. It was evident that some of the IDPs did not have these items.
2. There is need to emphasize adherence to the guidelines on relocations that were circulated in lieu of the relocation.
3. Better coordination required between inter-clusters to ensure key players are represented during the process.
4. There is a need to increase engagement with INGC including ensuring they are present in meetings so as to have a common understanding on similar activities.