

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

IDP CAMP CLOSURE ASSESSMENT REPORT

**CONTENTS**

	Paragraphs	Page
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>		<b>3</b>
<b>1. EVOLUTION OF THE IDP SITUATION</b>		<b>5</b>
Historical background	1.1 - 1.8	
Policy development and planning	1.9 - 1.11	
<b>2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>3. PROFILE OF THE POPULATION</b>		<b>7</b>
Population figures	3.1	
Counties and districts of origin	3.2 - 3.4	
Composition of the population	3.5 - 3.7	
Skills profile	3.8	
Persons with special needs	3.9 - 3.11	
<b>4. PROTECTION</b>		<b>8</b>
<b><u>Protection concerns</u></b>		<b>8</b>
Identified priority areas	4.1 - 4.3	
Law and order	4.4	
Relationship with local authorities	4.5	
<b><u>Reasons for continued stay in former camps</u></b>		<b>9</b>
Local integration	4.6 - 4.7	
Repatriation package	4.8	
Absence of valid registration documentation	4.9 - 4.15	
Prohibitive cost of transportation to areas of return	4.16	
Lack of family support	4.17	
Access to basic services	4.18	
<b><u>Property Issues</u></b>		<b>12</b>
Outlook on potential challenges	4.19 - 4.20	
Relationships with landowners	4.22 - 4.23	
Agreements for use of land as camps	4.24 - 4.30	

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

<b><u>Plans for the future</u></b>		<b>13</b>
Residents	4.31 - 4.34	
Landowners	4.35	
<b>5. INFRASTRUCTURE AND BASIC SERVICES</b>		<b>14</b>
Main observations	5.1 - 5.3	
Shelter	5.4 - 5.5	
Water	5.6 - 5.11	
Impact of lack of water and sanitation facilities	5.12 - 5.14	
Health facilities	5.15	
Educational facilities	5.16	
Availability of facilities in surrounding communities	5.17 - 5.18	
<b>6. ENVIRONMENT</b>		<b>17</b>
Priority areas of focus	6.1 -	
Environmental status of decommissioned former camps	6.2 - 6.4	
Environmental impact of remaining facilities	6.5 - 6.11	
Soil compaction, erosion gullies and silt deposits	6.12 - 6.13	
Pre- and post-ecological characteristics of former campsites	6.14 - 6.16	
Environmental impact of IDPs beyond camp boundaries	6.17	
Impact of relief delivery on roads and bridges	6.18	
<b>7. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>21</b>
Role of clusters	7.1 - 7.3	
Protection	7.4 - 7.8	
Property	7.9	
Basic services	7.10 - 7.11	
Environment	7.12 - 7.28	
<b>8. APPENDICES</b>		<b>25</b>

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

CAMP CLOSURE ASSESSMENT REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present report describes the background, objectives, main findings and recommendations for the Camp Closure Assessment exercise which commenced on 11 April and was completed on 9 May 2006. The exercise covered 34 former IDP camps and spontaneous settlements in four Counties. The exercise was carried out in support of the Government's Community Resettlement and Reintegration Strategy, following the return of a substantial number of IDPs and the subsequent closure of IDP repatriation process in a ceremony presided over by the Vice President of the Republic of Liberia, Mr. Joseph Boakai, on 20 April 2006.

As the lead agency for the Protection and Camp Management Clusters, UNHCR undertook to spearhead a multi-agency team to carry out the exercise under the auspices of the IDP Consultative Forum which is co-chaired by the Government and the Humanitarian Coordinator. The **objectives of the assessment** were defined and agreed by the members of the ICF as follows:

- a. to identify prevailing conditions and problems in the former IDP camps;
- b. to identify and recommend the appropriate response and responsible agency/governmental institution, to highlight funding requirements;
- c. to agree on a work plan following assessment missions.

The findings of the assessment are divided into four sections: population, protection, infrastructure and basic services and environment. The section on **population** provides statistics of residents present in the former camps (registered, non-registered, etc.), a skills profile and a description of persons with special needs. A total of 28,753 persons were determined to be living in the former camps as of 9 May 2006, including just over 16,000 who were part of the 314,000 listed on WFP's logs during the IDP return process.

The section on **protection** outlines the main concerns identified and lists reasons cited for continued stay in former camps. The assessment team notes that theft and domestic violence are the predominant protection concerns, corroborating reports that NRC monitoring reports submit to the Protection Core Group on a regular basis. A small number of people have opted to integrate into the local community for reasons that include ties with the community, education, and employment opportunities. A variety of reasons were cited for not leaving camps, most of them pointing to an expectation that additional assistance will be provided to support return. Issues regarding the absence of valid registration documentation are dealt with extensively.

The sub-section on **property**, highlights the potential for disputes among landowners resulting in the eviction of remaining populations from the land. It also pointed out the dire humanitarian conditions under which the IDPs camps were established and in the absence of clear attribution of responsibility for camp management to a single agency or entity, there was no forum for systematically anticipating and addressing the issue agreements for land use and rehabilitation. Concerns are raised about the possibility of vulnerable persons particularly the unaccompanied elderly and female-headed households, finding themselves unprotected should landowners at any point wish to retrieve land.

The section on **basic services** notes that despite the absence of external support for camp management, the leadership of the remaining population seemed to be well

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

organized. In contrast, the absence of service providers in the former camps was found to have some negative impact on the welfare of the remaining population. Examples include exposure of occupants of dilapidated shelters to risks of pneumonia and other respiratory tract illnesses due to the dampness and cold temperature, deterioration in the quality of drinking water, and declining sanitation conditions as residents defecate indiscriminately in the former camps in the absence of proper toilets.

The section on **environment** paints a picture of defilement of approximately 1,000 acres (471 ha) of land allocated for the former camps by individuals, communities, institutions and government authorities. The selection of camp sites, which occurred during the emergency period, did not take into account environmental considerations. As such, environmental problems worsened during the use as a camp and the decommissioning phase. The section describes the impact of haphazard demolition of shelters, disposal of construction and household wastes, decommissioning of wells, hand pumps, toilets and bathhouses that left the land scattered with plastics, batteries, sharp and corroded metallic objects, and human faeces. Loss of productive agricultural land for crops such as rubber, palm, cocoa, oranges, bananas, plantains, and kola nuts is underscored. Almost all locations visited manifested evidence of advanced stages of soil compaction and the development of deep erosion gullies.

A series of **recommendations** is proposed in the final section, premised on the understanding that they will be taken forward by cluster lead agencies with the full engagement of the Government. Attention is drawn to the need for community involvement in addressing concerns about protection, basic services and the environment. The clusters identified for implementing the recommendations are:

- Camp management
- Emergency shelter
- Food
- Health
- Protection
- Water and sanitation

*Financial requirements*

Financial requirements for recommended interventions in former camps have been computed at USD 2,947,500 over a period of two years. Direct beneficiaries of assistance comprise an estimated 13,000 IDPs who were previously registered and then disqualified from WFP logs as they were not included in the final verification exercise in June 2004 which validated 314,000 camp-based IDPs eligible for assistance. For this group, provision has been made for food and non-food items, trucking and ambulance services and printing of resettlement cards. Direct beneficiaries also include up to 400 persons with special needs, comprising mostly unaccompanied elderly, physically disabled, and single parents, of whom the majority were either female or elderly. Provision is made for counselling services to support them to be active members of communities as well as to provide individual shelter kits and latrine slabs to the families they belong to.

The budget makes provision for community-based assistance in all 34 former IDP camps covered by the assessment exercise, to benefit host communities and former IDPs who have opted to integrate locally. This includes the construction and furnishing of three primary schools and four health clinics, the installation of 15 wells, and the implementation of a range of demolition and clean-up activities alongside projects to restore vegetation (tree nurseries, wood lots, vegetable production).

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

*Next steps*

The present report is to be submitted to the ICF for endorsement, following which the concerned cluster leads will be called upon to develop an actionable work plan and timetable to address the findings and recommendations.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

**1 - EVOLUTION OF THE IDP SITUATION IN LIBERIA**

*Historical background*

- 1.1 The civil conflict which took place in Liberia during the last 14 years resulted in the displacement of hundreds of thousands of citizens from their places of origin in search of safety both inside and outside the country. At the height of the conflict, an estimated 500,000 Liberians were displaced internally and took refuge in camps, spontaneous settlements, with families, in host communities and in public places.
- 1.2 Liberia's chronology took a positive turn in the latter half of 2003 when through the intervention of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and later by the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), hostilities were replaced by the gradual restoration of peace and stability. A Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed by the main fighting factions and representatives of civil society in Accra, Ghana in August 2003.
- 1.3 In August 2003, the arrival of ECOMIL troops—vanguard of the United Nations peacekeeping force—found the city of Monrovia congested. Public places such as schools, clinics, stadia and office buildings were crowded with displaced persons. Thousands took refuge in unoccupied public buildings and continue to live there to this day. A collaborative inter-agency effort helped to decongest the city. Those who opted to leave were transferred to camps. In the process, 314,000 IDPs were registered. By the end of 2003, 22 formal camps and 13 spontaneous settlements had mushroomed mostly around Monrovia and along the main road to Bong County in the interior. Each IDP camp accommodated between 500 and 28,000 persons.
- 1.4 Overall 323,827 persons were registered with WFP, comprising 314,095 IDPs and 9,732 Liberian refugees who returned spontaneously from Sierra Leone and were accommodated in IDP camps in the interim until their counties of origin were declared "safe for return."
- 1.5 A number of benchmarks, mostly regarding the political and security situation in the country underpinned the decision to start the organised return of IDPs to their places of origin in November 2004. These included, *inter alia*:
  - the declaration of counties as being safe for return as UNMIL troops were deployed;
  - the end of disarmament and demobilisation (31 October 2004);
  - the official dissolution and transformation of Liberia's main warring factions into political parties (03 November 2004);
  - the spontaneous return of Liberian refugees and IDPs signalling that the people themselves deemed conditions of safety to be adequate.
- 1.6 From the start of the IDP return and reintegration process in early November 2004 to end of March 2006, 321,634 IDPs were deregistered and provided with the humanitarian return package containing domestic, personal hygiene and food items as well as transportation assistance in cash (or in-kind for vulnerable persons).
- 1.7 On 20 April 2006 a ceremony was held in Salala Camp, Bong County, where the Government of Liberia officially declared the IDP return process completed.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- 1.8 As of 26 May 2006, 267,563 (83%) of all deregistered IDPs had collected their second food ration from WFP in areas of return, indicating that these people returned to counties of origin<sup>1</sup>.

*Policy development and planning*

- 1.9 The IDP Consultative Forum (ICF) is the policy-making body on IDP repatriation and reintegration activities. The ICF is composed of the heads of key UN agencies involved in the IDP return and reintegration process, as well as major donors, a representative of the Management Steering Group of NGOs, and two representatives of IDP leadership. It is co-chaired by the Executive Director of the Liberian Refugee Repatriation and Resettlement Commission (LRRRC) and the Humanitarian Coordinator.
- 1.10 The Comprehensive Peace Accord signed in August 2003, followed by the disarmament and demobilization of the ex-combatants and the Result Focus Transitional Framework (RFTF) set the basis for the formulation of a strategy document known as Community Resettlement and Reintegration Strategy” of the National Transitional Government of Liberia (NTGL). This political document was translated into a Humanitarian Action Plan by the NTGL and the humanitarian community, which provided the basis for the commencement of the IDP repatriation on 8 November, 2004.
- 1.11 In July 2005, UNHCR assumed the principal role in coordinating and managing the IDP protection response in Liberia at the request of the Emergency Relief Coordinator. Subsequently, the IASC Principals decided, in September 2005, to adopt the Cluster Approach as part of the humanitarian reform process, and designated Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda as pilot countries with effect from 01 January 2006.
- 1.12 In support of the Government’s Community Resettlement and Reintegration Strategy, and following the return of a substantial number of IDPs and the subsequent closure of some of the camps, the humanitarian community saw the need to address the issue of camp closure, consolidation, and clean-up.
- 1.13 In January 2006, the IDP Consultative Forum proposed to conduct an assessment following completion of camp-based IDP repatriation activities. As the lead agency for the Protection and Camp Management Clusters, UNHCR undertook to spearhead a multi-agency team to carry out the exercise. UNHCR was subsequently tasked by the ICF to develop the team’s TOR and a camp assessment questionnaire. A final version incorporating significant input from ICF members was endorsed by the ICF on 28 March 2006.

**2 – OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

- 2.1 The objectives of the assessment, as established in the TOR were to:
- d. identify prevailing conditions and problems in the former IDP camps;

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures supplied by WFP Liberia

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- e. identify and recommend the appropriate response and responsible agency/governmental institution, to highlight funding requirements;
- f. agree on a work plan following assessment missions.

**3 - MAIN FINDINGS: PROFILE OF THE POPULATION**

*Population figures<sup>2</sup>*

- 3.1 A total of 28,753 persons were determined to be living in the former camps as of 9 May 2006. Wilson Corner, Perry and Plumkor had the highest number of remaining population where more than three thousand people are remaining in each camp. On the other hand, three former camps, Fendell, Unification, Tumutu, and Maimu III had less than 50 people remaining.

*Counties and districts of origin<sup>3</sup>*

- 3.2 The major Counties of origin, according to those persons interviewed, are Gbarpolu, Bomi, Grand Cape Mount, Bong, and Lofa. In addition, there are persons originating from Sinoe, Nimba, River Cess, and Grand Bassa.
- 3.3 In the locations that continue to host the largest populations such as Wilson, Blamacee, Perry, Jah Tondo, Conneh, and E.J. Yancy the main Districts of return are located in Bomi, Bong, Gbarpolu, and Lofa Counties. These include Tubmanburg, Sueh, Clay, Fuamah, Sanoyea, Knogba, Henry Town, Belleh, Gbama, Bopolu, Gbokomu, Voinjama, Zorzor, Foya and Kolahun.
- 3.4 The assessment team recognised that some of the Districts mentioned above are less accessible and have benefited to a lesser degree from post-conflict reconstruction.

*Composition of the population*

- 3.5 Based on the sampling exercise, the assessment team determined there to be 16,324 of the original registered camp population of 323,826 living in the 35 former camps. This is about 5% of the original population.
- 3.6 There were about 12,492 individuals who were not part of the original figure of 323,826 but who for various reasons are residing in the former camps. The majority fall into the category of IDPs who were removed from WFP logs after a verification exercise in mid-2004<sup>4</sup>.
- 3.6.1 A very small number are either people who came to live in the former camps after verification of IDPs was completed (hence were never registered), or local residents who moved into the former camps after the IDPs left. In E.J. Yancy and Freeman Reserve, the number of "arrivals post-verification" and of "local residents" was larger than in other locations, numbering some 200 and 300 persons, respectively.

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to appendices II & III for details

<sup>3</sup> See appendix VII

<sup>4</sup> See appendix XIV for details on the verification exercise

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

*Skills profile*

- 3.7 Although the assessment did not collect figures on the number of skilled persons, it was generally recognised from the completed questionnaires that the majority of persons living in the former camps are unskilled. Among those who professed to hold a skill, the most frequently mentioned were: farming/agriculture, carpentry, soap-making, tie-dye, and tailoring. A small number of teachers, masons, and traditional birth attendants were also reported to be present. In nearly all cases skills were not being practised due to financial constraints that prevented business start-up. Income-generation will play an important role in the integration of this population, whether in the areas of return or closed camps.

*Persons with special needs*

- 3.8 Three hundred and ninety-nine (399) individuals with special needs were identified during the assessment. UNHCR uses the term "special need" to refer to those refugees and people of concern who may require specific interventions or assistance which they cannot provide for themselves. The most common category of persons were the unaccompanied elderly, physically disabled, and single parents, of whom the majority were either female or elderly. Some individuals were originally registered IDPs who had received a repatriation package, whilst others admitted they had not been registered. An exact breakdown of this is not available. The areas with the greatest number include Jah Tondo, Perry, Basaymah, Plumkor, VOA-1, Wilson.
- 3.9 During interviews the assessment team learned that several individuals felt incapable of self-sufficiency in meeting food or shelter needs. In some instances this precluded them from returning home, and in others it was identified as a problem even if they remain in the former camp area. A number of persons were worried because they do not have anyone to look after them. A smaller group believed that family may be living in areas of return but they did not know how they could trace or contact them. In the case of certain sick or disabled individuals, the concern was access to medical care.
- 3.10 For almost every camp assessed, basic biodata was collected on individual cases of persons with special needs. This basic information includes the name, age, location, special needs and other remarks. Where this information was not available, the team collected figures on the categories of special needs. UNHCR currently holds this information and is maintaining the confidentiality of these cases.

**4. MAIN FINDINGS: PROTECTION**

A. PROTECTION CONCERNS

*Identified priority areas*

- 4.1 The main concerns as perceived and reported by the population itself were predominantly theft and domestic violence. NRC monitors, and other agency staff, in addition to LNP officers and local authorities, referred to a low level of

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

other protection problems including child labour, child abuse, early marriage, physical assault, and rape.

- 4.2 Those living in the former camps perceived the protection concerns to have dropped in number, in line with the drop in population over previous months. Very little detail was provided on these cases by the population, and statistics were not available during the assessment visits.
- 4.3 The concerns raised by the population are corroborated by NRC monitoring reports, which show a decrease in cases. In February 2006, 40 separate reports from a total of 18 camps were collected compared with 28 from 12 camps in March, 14 cases from 10 camps in April, and only six cases from three camps in May. In total, 88 protection cases were reported from 18 camps and a further 32 issues related to the repatriation process were also collected by monitors. Three of the 88 cases were in fact reports of rape that took place in 2003 and 2005.
- 4.4 The concerns dominating the NRC reports, as the population pointed out, were frequently gender-based violence (domestic violence, rape, early marriage), child abuse, physical assault, theft, and robbery. In terms of GBV, there were eight rapes reported in February (one of which turned out to be a hoax, and a second which occurred in 2003), one attempted rape and three rapes (two of which occurred in 2003 and 2005) in March, three rape cases in April, and three in May. Domestic violence decreased from 12 reports in February, to six in March, three in April, and one in May.

*Law and order*

- 4.5 Only in a few locations was it noted that the local authorities were not recognised by the remaining population as taking responsibility for law and order. These included Basaymah, Catholic Compound, and Civil Compound where the former IDP leadership has remained. In most other locations both the population and the local chiefs interviewed accepted their relationship and examples were given of cases that had been referred to the town chief, landlord, or elders. In several locations, the community commented that more serious cases may be taken to the LNP. This was not the case in areas where the LNP is located at a far distance from the former camps.

*Relationship with local authorities*

- 4.6 The relationship between persons still living in former camps and the local authorities was described as cordial in almost every location visited. Concerns were raised only in Blamacee and Jah Tondo where the removal of facilities had provoked some animosity, and in Mount Barclay and Promise Land where the original host community perceived the camp inhabitants as either thieves or a threat to employment rates. At Wilson, friction between the camp population and the landlord was observed.

**B. REASONS FOR CONTINUED STAY IN FORMER CAMPS**

*Local integration*

- 4.7 The assessment team collected information, albeit in small numbers on individuals living who have chosen to integrate into the local community

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

because of ties with the community, education, and employment opportunities. [Concerned camps: Children's Home, Civil Compound, Conneh, E.J. Yancy, New land, Promised land, Salala, and Seigbeh]

*Relocation*

- 4.8 A number of individuals moved from local communities to the camps for different reasons. Of this group, Mount Barclay had the highest number. In E.J. Yancy Camp, students have reportedly moved to the area to attend the neighbouring school. Also, some community members from Totota who moved to the camp initially for security and have remained ever since. In Freeman Reserved, the majority of local residents living there are working on the rubber farm. Besides these reasons, local residents live in former camps to either save on rent, or to be close to farms where they are employed. Besides one or two individual cases, which were documented by the team, this population does not present any urgent needs above and beyond those present in any community of Liberia.

*Repatriation package*

- 4.9 In a significant number of former camps, individuals told the team that they remain there because they did not receive a repatriation package. The majority of these individuals did not report longer-term plans to the assessment team. A smaller number mentioned that they believed family members might be in return areas but they were unsure. The assessment team noted a tendency among those interviewed to group all of the population together, whether registered or unregistered, when discussing the repatriation packages. This suggests that residents who were never registered could be harbouring hopes of receiving assistance too. [Concerned camps: Basaymah, Bernard Curve, Blamacee, Catholic Compound, E.J. Yancy, Freeman Reserve, Horton, Jah Tondo, Kingsville, Maimu I, Maimu II, Maimu III, Mount Barclay, Promised Land, Ricks, Seighbeh, Sinje III, Soul Clinic Unification, VOA, and Wilson].
- 4.9 Several of the individuals concerned showed the team an out-of-date ration card or chip, as proof of their earlier registration. It is worth noting that the procedures that were introduced to provide return assistance did not include a re-registration, and instead relied upon the most recent WFP log, which automatically excluded such individuals from the process.
- 4.10 Another group comprises individuals who admitted that they arrived after the verification had taken place. For both the "deleted" cases and those who arrived after verification, the assessment team was told that lack of return assistance was a significant factor in their choice to remain in the former camps. [Concerned camps: Bernard Curve, Maimu I, Maimu II, Newland, Unification, and VOA]
- 4.11 The assessment team received reports of IDPs who allegedly received only *part* of the return assistance. For example, in Conneh Camp seven family heads said they were yet to receive their cash assistance. The assessment team however was satisfied that these cases were earlier attended to and that there are no outstanding cases of partial distribution of return package. [Concerned camps: Basayma, Conneh, Jah Tondo, Mount Barclay, Perry and Sinje III]

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- 4.12 The team was informed that some individuals hold valid WFP ration cards, yet WFP had not de-registered them. The most likely explanation for this report is that the persons concerned were not present in the camp at the time when de-registration and distribution took place. It is widely understood that many IDPs had returned to areas of origin to begin rebuilding or for the planting season. [Concerned camp: Basaymah]
- 4.13 A smaller group of persons maintained that although registered their tickets had been misplaced but their names remained on the log. The assessment team agreed that such cases did exist previously. However, in a separate exercise, a team comprising LRRRC, WFP, IDP Unit, and NRC reviewed all such cases camp by camp, identified genuine cases, and provided the return package. [Concerned camps: Catholic Compound, Horton, Kingsville, and Mount Barclay]

*Prohibitive cost of transportation to areas of return*

- 4.14 Among those who said that they had received the full return package, a recurring theme was the complaint that the transportation allowance was insufficient for the distances to be covered and luggage to be transported. Prices were reportedly inflated after the transport industry gained the impression that IDPs had received large sums of cash as part of the return package. [Concerned camps: Children Home, Conneh, E.J. Yancy, Fendell, Kingsville, Newland, Perry, Promise Land, and Wilson]

*Lack of family support*

- 4.17 In several cases lack of support to persons with special needs (paragraphs 3.9 - 3.11) was cited as an explanation for the person remaining behind. In nearly all of these cases, these individuals considered themselves to be alone either in the camp, in the areas of return, or indeed in both locations.

*Access to services in places of return*

- 4.18 A number of other concerns were mentioned by both those who were and were not beneficiaries of the return assistance.
- a. Education: A number of families with students still enrolled in schools located in or near the former camps expressed concerns at disrupting education before the end of the school year. Others stated that they would not return because schools are lacking in the areas of return. [Concerned districts: Gbarpolu (Gbokomu, Belle, Bopolu Districts), Lofa (Foya, Zorzor), Bong (Sanoyea) and to a lesser degree in Bomi, Grand Cape Mount, River Cess, and Sinoe Counties]
  - b. Health: Absence of health clinics was mentioned expressly by population in E.J.Yancy. In the same location, specific concerns about an insufficient supply of seeds and tools in areas of return were also raised.
  - c. Shelter: Some interviewees described how they had either returned home to find their houses destroyed, or had received news from other returnees about the condition of their accommodation. A number of those persons with special needs interviewed specifically mentioned shelter as a major constraint for them to return home to these same locations. [Concerned

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

areas of return: Bong, Gbarpolu, and Lofa Counties, as well as a smaller number from Bomi and Grand Cape Mount]

C. PROPERTY ISSUES

*Outlook on potential challenges*

- 4.19 It must be understood from the outset that under the circumstances in which the IDPs camps developed (ie. mostly spontaneously in fast moving emergency humanitarian conditions), and perhaps more importantly in the absence of clear responsibility for camp management having been assigned to a single agency or entity, there was no forum for systematically anticipating and addressing the issue of agreements for land use and rehabilitation.
- 4.20 The assessment team noted the potential for property disputes among landowners with an interest in the same parcel of land. This in turn could result in the remaining population being evicted from the land. In some areas mention has already been made by landowners of plans for surveys or to move shelters from their current locations. In attempts to consolidate ownership, some landlords may attempt to allocate parcels of land to family members. In other locations, sale of land to construction companies for profit would likely lead to an eviction of the population.
- 4.21 In some cases, where those with special needs may have weaker bargaining powers, there is also potential for these individuals, particularly the unaccompanied elderly and female-headed households, to find themselves unprotected should the landlord at any point wish to retrieve land.

*Relationships with landowners*

- 4.22 Overall, the assessment team described the relationship between landowners and remaining populations as good or cordial. It should be recognised that in more than 50% of locations, the land covered by the camp has multiple landowners. While this may not directly affect the relationship between landowner and tenant, it may still impact upon the remaining population as in some cases there is an existing property dispute among landowners, for example at Ricks and Blamacee.
- 4.23 In Wilson and 15 Gate, some friction was observed due to perceived threats that the landlord wished to retrieve his/her land soon, to the detriment of the population living upon it.

*Agreements for use of land as camps*

- 4.24 The assessment team was informed by landlords, LRRRC monitors and community members of agreements to use the land for camps. However, not one single written agreement was made available to corroborate these assertions. In a few cases it was acknowledged that informal or verbal agreements were made. [Concerned camps: Tumutu, Basayma, Bernard Curve, Newland, Catholic Compound, Mount Barclay, Salala, Soul Clinic, and Wilson]
- 4.25 The impact of the above is that there is no evidence of any formal commitment to address environmental damage. There are no commitments by the landlord to look favourably upon any remaining population in terms of

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

use of the land. Nor is there any official reference to ownership of the facilities left behind by agencies intervening in the former camps. In reality, the relationship with the remaining population does not appear to have been negatively affected by the lack of formal agreement (see below), except in those cases where landlords have allegedly removed facilities without first discussing with or informing the inhabitants.

- 4.26 In the majority of locations, the population has been permitted informally to remain. With all of these informal arrangements, the assessment team was informed that money was not involved. The period for which people have been allowed to remain was generally unclear, as landlords appeared to be making plans for future use of the land (see below). [Concerned camps: Children's Home, Salala, Soul Clinic, Basaymah, Bernard Curve, E.J. Yancy, Maimu III, Sinje III, Perry, Promise Land, and Ricks]
- 4.27 In Fendell, Wilson, and 15 Gate dates had been announced by which time inhabitants were expected to vacate the land.
- 4.28 In a handful of cases, formal arrangements were being put in place, which included purchase and lease of the land. In Blamacee, for example, 10 persons had entered into negotiations with the landlord while in Conneh, 80 persons have already paid \$5USD each to remain for up to two years on the land. In Freeman Reserved, the population indicated that they are paying a monthly fee of LD\$50.00 per hut to the landlord. [Concerned camps: Blamacee, Conneh, Jah Tondo, and a minority of people in Salala and Perry]
- 4.29 In other former camps, the assessment team was informed that official requests to remain on the land have been submitted to the local authorities and landlords. [Concerned camps: Jah Tondo and Civil Compound].
- 4.30 The inclusion of persons with special needs in arrangements with landowners was not systematic. In some areas, this group was part of the negotiations and individuals were well-informed, yet in other locations individuals with special needs were observed to be unsure about arrangements being made for the land.

**D. PLANS FOR THE FUTURE**

*Residents of former IDP camps*

- 4.31 The assessment team asked interviewees to explain their future plans. Most frequently, and most widespread, was the response that people wish to return but are waiting for assistance from either the Government or the international community in order to do so. Beyond this statement, the population was often unable to commit itself or to provide concrete examples of how they would organise themselves to go home or rebuild their lives now that return assistance has ended. The preoccupation with humanitarian assistance and return packages is highly significant. It is such that IDPs appear almost unable to plan for any alternative such as spontaneous return or local integration. [Concerned camps: Former camps where this was expressly noted were Basaymah, Blamacee, Jah Tondo, Maimu I, Maimu II, Maimu III, Perry, Plumkor, Promise Land, Ricks, Seighbeh, Soul Clinic, Unification, and Wilson]

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- 4.32 Of those remaining behind, very few have organised to purchase or lease land, and in some locations the population has not entered into discussion with the landlord even to make informal arrangements. This may be an indication of the population's intention to leave the area in the future, although it may also reflect a general inertia or dependency observed almost throughout by the assessment team.
- 4.33 In contrast with the dependency exhibited by most, a smaller number of individuals commented that they were planning to return by themselves but were either waiting for the end of a school year or employment contract, completion of house rehabilitation, or were indeed working towards saving money to facilitate their movement home. During the assessment of Blamacee, the population explicitly requested assistance to return before the rainy season.
- 4.34 Among those who talked about reintegration in the area of the former camp, a number of individuals had taken steps to formalise arrangements for the land with the landlord or local authorities. In Children Home, New Land, and Promise Land, we were told that the majority of the population wishes to remain. In some locations such as Conneh, Morris Farm, Ricks and Blamacee the population expressed a wish to remain, and a concern as to how they would actually achieve this.

*Landowners*

- 4.35 In many areas, the landlords told the assessment team that they had future plans for use of the land although timeframes were not specified, such as:
- a. Hope to construct property [Basaymah, E.J.Yancy, Jah Tondo, Promise Land, Perry, and Kingsville]
  - b. Actively seeking investment for property construction [Sinje, Catholic Compound]
  - c. Farming and planting of crops [Basaymah, E.J.Yancy, Bernard Curve, Seighbeh, Hortin, Plumkor, Salala]
  - d. Replanting and exploitation of rubber [Conneh, Maimu I, Maimu II, and Maimu III camps]

**5 – MAIN FINDINGS: INFRASTRUCTURE AND BASIC SERVICES**

*Main observations*

- 5.1 During the assessment it was observed that in almost all the locations, small groups of the remaining population were serving as leaders and managing the affairs of the former camps. Composition and mode of appointment of these leaders varied from place to place. In some of the areas, the remnants of the original leadership continued their work whereas in others new leaders were elected or appointed. Both males and females were represented in the leadership team and in several places the chairperson was a woman, for example in Promise Land.
- 5.2 With the exception of Salala IDP camp where LWS was present to wind up their activities, there was no camp management in place in any of the other 33 former camps assessed. The absence of camp management team did not seem to negatively affect the situation in the former camps. The present

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

leadership of the remaining population seemed to be well organized in most of the locations visited. Indeed, it was the leadership who were strongly advocating for those whose names were deleted from the WFP logs and in many of the former camps have a list of these people in their possession. The leadership also resolved disputes and conflicts among the residents.

- 5.3 There are presently no service providers in the former camps and their absence was found to have some negative impact on the welfare of the remaining population. Prior to the commencement of the return process, there were many NGOs providing services such as water and sanitation, health and nutrition, education, shelter, etc.

*Shelter*

- 5.4 Out of approximately 64,000 original shelters in the former camps, 7,048 were remaining as of May 9, 2006.<sup>5</sup> This represents about 10% of the total number of shelters existing before the return process.
- 5.5 6,633 of the remaining shelters are occupied and 415 are abandoned. Most of the huts which are occupied are in very poor condition. As a result of damaged tarpaulins, most of the shelters are leaking, and sticks supporting the shelters are rotten. Persons inhabiting these shelters are exposed to risks of pneumonia and other respiratory tract illnesses due to the dampness and cold temperature.

*Water and sanitation*

- 5.6 There were functioning hand pumps and/or wells in all the former camps visited except for VOA which never had one. However, the quantity and quality of water differed from place to place. Mount Barclay had the highest number of hand pumps (17), followed by Perry Town (11). 11 of the former camps have only one hand pump each.
- 5.7 In proportion to the remaining population, Massaquoi Town had the lowest number of persons per functioning hand pump (30:1) and Salala the highest (531:1).
- 5.8 Water facilities were reportedly stolen or removed by the landowners in most of the former camps at the onset of the IDP return process. Some landowners took it as compensation for the land they gave to the IDPs.
- 5.9 Of the 34 former camps assessed, toilet facilities were present in only 22 of them. The remaining 12, including Jah Tondo which had a remaining population close to 2,000, have no toilet facilities at all. Even in those places where there were facilities, they were found to be far fewer than would support the existing population. For example, Perry and Ricks have only three and two toilets respectively for a population of more than 3,500. Furthermore, it is not certain how long these facilities will remain since there are no service providers to maintain them or provide new ones when the present ones are filled up.
- 5.10 The original bathhouses constructed by IPs were either completely removed or insufficient for use by the remaining population. Similar to the toilet

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to appendix IV & V for details

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

facilities, the bathhouses provided by the service providers were vandalized, stolen, or removed by the landowners or others at the onset of the return process in some of the former camps. In nearly every former camp visited, attempts had been made by the remaining population to build makeshift bathhouses behind or in close proximity to their shelters. Poor drainage system of wastewater characterized the current state of bathhouses, including those built by residents.

- 5.11 There are no garbage pits in 26 of the 34 former camps assessed. In the remaining eight camps, the number available ranges from one to five which is not enough for the remaining population.

*Impact of lack of WATSAN facilities*

- 5.12 As a consequence of the removal of the hand pumps, the quality of drinking water in some of the former camps was poor. For the wells with no pumps, no efforts had been made to properly secure the water from pollution or contamination, for example foreign objects were observed floating in some of the wells. The inhabitants had no option but to use the available water even if it is polluted; posing serious health hazards such as diarrhoea and dysentery.

- 5.13 The negative impact of lack of toilet facilities in some of the former camps cannot be overemphasized. Sanitation conditions in most of the former camps were appalling as residents indiscriminately defecate around and in the former camps. Even in former camps with existing toilets, the acrid smell of decomposing faeces and the unsanitary conditions had forced residents to abandon their use and defecate either openly or in plastic bags which were disposed of haphazardly. In some former camps, the stench of human faeces was over-powering, and with the onset of the rains, raw sewage was washed into nearby streams (some of which were used by residents for drinking). Evidently, this could lead to outbreaks of dysentery, typhoid, and cholera. Furthermore, the assessment team is concerned that the use of the bush to defecate may place women and girls at greater risk of gender-based violence.

- 5.14 Concerning the impact of the lack of bathhouses on the remaining populations, two key health concerns can be raised: 1) In some former camps, the location of bathhouses constructed by the residents themselves was up-slope of wells and hand pumps, potentially leading to contamination of the drinking water. 2) The pool of wastewater behind the structures acts as an ideal breeding site for malaria-carrying mosquitoes. This potentially exacerbates the incidence of the disease in the remaining population, again accentuated by the absence or withdrawal of clinics/health facilities.

*Health facilities*

- 5.15 Only four of the former camps (Catholic Compound, Conneh, Wilson and Blamacee) had functioning clinics. These had already been handed over to the communities by the agencies which provided them and they were being managed by the communities through revolving funds. Fees are collected from patients who use the clinics. There are community clinics near a few of the former camps, such as Perry and Newland which the remaining population had access to. The majority of the population living in former camps did not have easy access to health facilities.

*Educational facilities*

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- 5.16 There were functioning schools in nine of the 35 former camps . These were built by the NGOs who were working in the former camps and have been handed over to the communities.

*Availability of facilities in the surrounding communities*

- 5.17 Most of the former camps are located in close proximity to existing communities; hence it is possible for the remaining population to use the facilities that are in these communities. This is the case for locations such as Blamacee and Perry Town. Unfortunately, some of the communities themselves lack these facilities. For example neither the former camps of Jah Tondo and Sinje 3 nor the nearby communities have any toilet facilities.
- 5.18 Availability of educational facilities is much better in the communities. As stated above, there are basic schools in nine of the former camps and there are also schools in most of the nearby communities which the children in the former camps are attending.

**6 - MAIN FINDINGS: ENVIRONMENT**

*Priority areas*

- 6.1 Based on the TOR provided and the expert opinions of team members, the following comprised the main issues addressed by the environment section:
- Area extent and topography of the camp environment;
  - Land use prior to the establishment of the IDP camp to determine which rehabilitation activities could be envisaged;
  - Vision of landlord or landowner for rehabilitation;
  - Current land use by remaining IDPs and communities;
  - Ecological profile of the land before its use as a camp;
  - Determine if any of the former uses/ecological profiles of the land has been lost/reduced/enhanced;
  - Determine which facilities (e.g. wells, hand pumps, toilets, laundry slabs, graveyards, garbage pits, bathhouses, etc) may constitute environmental threats or potential health hazards to the local population;
  - Actions needed to remove these risks, which agency could take on this responsibility, funding requirements and technical assistance required at each site;
  - Identify damage to other infrastructure like roads and bridges as a result of relief services.

*Environmental status of decommissioned former camps*

- 6.2 It was observed by the assessment team that the selection of camp sites, which occurred during the emergency period, did not take into account environmental considerations. As such, environmental problems worsened during the running of the camps and the decommissioning phase.
- 6.3 Some of the former camps visited lacked a coherent plan in demolition of shelters, disposal of construction and household wastes, decommissioning of wells, hand pumps, toilets and bathhouses. In some former camps, the

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

demolition of shelters was done in a haphazard manner, creating pockets of “perfect shelters” in turn surrounded by demolished structures and the attendant wastes comprising plastics, batteries, sharp and corroded metallic objects, and human faeces. As described above under section 2.4.4, access to toilets and hand pumps is also limited following the removal of many of these facilities.

- 6.4 In almost all the former camps visited, landowners expressed their dissatisfaction at the inability of the responsible authorities to assist them in restoring the land to its former use. Some landlords demanded that someone take responsibility for disposing of the wastes and hazards left behind by the IDPs. It also came to light that memoranda of understanding were never signed with the Government regarding the use and rehabilitation of the land. Loss of productive agricultural land for crops such as rubber, palm, cocoa, oranges, bananas, plantains, and kola nuts was underscored by landowners in every camp visited. In general, the land area allocated for the construction of the former camps by individuals, communities, institutions and government authorities varied from 0.12 ha (1 lot) to 54 ha (115 acres), with a total area of land for all 34 former camps assessed approximately 1,000 acres (471 ha)

*Environmental impact of remaining facilities:*

- 6.5 The facilities considered during the assessment included toilets, bathhouses, hand pumps/wells, garbage pits/dumpsites, house ‘spots’/construction materials, and laundry slabs/transit centres. The current status of the facilities has been presented in the preceding section hence only the environmental impact is presented here.
- 6.6 Toilets: In a few former camps, attempts were made to backfill some of the pits. Most of them were beginning to sink in again as there was no plan in place for subsequent backfilling as the sewage decomposes. Around some of these open pit latrines, the vegetation has started to regenerate, and could pose hidden safety concerns for the remaining population, wildlife, and those wanting to rehabilitate the land.
- 6.7 Wells and hand pumps: The status of wells and hand pumps differed from camp to camp. In general, most wells/pumps had been sunk in valley bottoms where the water table could be reached easily. Sometimes they were located in close proximity to bathhouses, laundry slabs, and toilets, potentially contaminating the ground water sources. The concrete slabs around the wells/pumps in some former camps were in a poor state of repairs, some with large cracks/openings that could serve as conduits for the infiltration of pollutants.
- 6.8 Garbage pits/dumpsites: The sites (garbage pits) previously designated for household wastes were no longer being utilized by the remaining population, except where they were in close proximity to shelters. There was massive disposal of household wastes<sup>6</sup> without attention to recycling or to the resulting unsanitary conditions. Most garbage pits located away from shelters had not been back-filled and were seldom used by the remaining population. These open pits pose safety concerns for both wildlife and humans. The team learnt of one case where an elderly woman fell into an open pit at Conneh Camp

---

<sup>6</sup> The wastes observed included plastics, metallic objects, old shoes, sardine cans, nails, lead batteries, and plastic sheets.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

and suffered broken limbs. One positive aspect of dumpsites observed in most former camps is the profuse regeneration of economic crops like bananas/plantains, mangoes, papayas and other vegetables. The rich organic matter at these sites could also be used for enriching the soil around house spots for vegetable gardening.

- 6.9 House spots/construction materials: Most shelters in several former camps visited had not been properly demolished and there were still empty shelters in a poor state of repairs that could accidentally fall on people<sup>7</sup>. An assortment of household wastes and construction materials were observed surrounding shelters, some buried and some still exposed. In the newly decommissioned Salala Camp, many rusty nails remain exposed on the ground, posing threats to the population especially when natural vegetation starts to reclaim the land.
- 6.10 Domestic needs: The assessment team observed the residents burning construction poles for charcoal production. Around some of the house spots, the regeneration of green vegetables such as coloured greens, beans, and potato leaves was observed. They are being harvested for sale and home consumption. In nearly all the locations visited, families and individuals were clearing the house spots of non-degradable wastes and utilizing the sites for vegetable gardening and the cultivation of economic crops like cassava, bananas/plantains and maize (corn). These house spots are rich in nutrients and have a high moisture content compared to adjacent compacted footpaths between the house spots. The house spots could serve as catalysts for beginning rehabilitation work on the land and transforming them into sites for the production of economic benefits for landowners and communities.
- 6.11 Laundry slabs and transit centres: In some former camps, laundry slabs and the floors of transit and food distribution centres were made of concrete of varying depth and strength. They had been left in place following the decommissioning of the camp. These slabs are impenetrable to the roots of plants, and could prevent the re-establishment of the natural vegetation. In addition, they could take up valuable agricultural land and prevent landowners and communities from utilizing them for productive agricultural enterprises. Because some of the laundry slabs and transit centre floors are located distances away from the remaining shelters, some individuals had begun to defecate in these areas.

*Soil compaction, erosion gullies and silt deposits*

- 6.12 Almost all locations visited manifested evidence of advanced stages of soil compaction and the development of deep erosion gullies. The degree of soil compaction varied from camp to camp and was a product of camp population density, tree density and slope of the land. Heavily compacted soils were observed at Maimu I, II, and III, E. J. Yancy, Salala, Conneh, Horton Farm, Blamacee and Jah Tondo camps. The topsoil in these former camps had been washed away and heavy human traffic between shelters had left the areas heavily compacted. Soil compaction in these former camps was also due to frequent movement of relief vehicles and the concentration of IDPs for relief supplies at any given time. Evidence of soil compaction was noted from

---

<sup>7</sup> NRC and HRPF have already reported more than 5 incidences when shelters fell onto people.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

the occurrence of indicative plant species observed in nearly all of the former camps<sup>8</sup>

- 6.13 Erosion in several former camps was at an advanced stage largely due to the clearance of pre-camp vegetation and the failure to engage in any tree planting activities during the life of the camp. Deep gullies as much as 4 - 6 feet deep were observed at Conneh, Salala, E. J. Yancy, Maimu I, and Maimu II Camps. In Conneh camp, the situation was so bad that the road had become impassable for vehicles. Moreover, these gullies had become dumpsites for household wastes, and with the onset of the rains, both topsoil and non-degradable materials were being transported into nearby swamps through these gullies, leading to the suffocation of freshwater wildlife.

*Pre- and post-ecological characteristics of former campsites*

- 6.14 The predominant use of land was agriculture, with oil palm (natural and cultivated), rubber, plantain/banana, cocoa, cola nut, pear, and mango being the landowners' preferred crops. The land adjoining these cultivated areas provided an abundant resource base for the exploitation of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). With the influx of thousands of IDPs, the land had been cleared of most natural and cultivated trees to make way for the construction of shelters and other basic facilities. The reduction in vegetation cover exposed the land to erosion leading to the development of gullies and causing silt deposits in nearby swamps and water bodies.
- 6.15 From dialogue with landowners, there would appear to be an imbalance in the ecological services now produced by the land. Soil nutrient levels are reportedly low and the heavily compacted soils and deep gullies have reduced agricultural potential. Improper waste disposal has reduced the aesthetics and natural look of the land, with non-degradable materials finding their way into water bodies and even the soil.
- 6.16 In a number of locations visited, the resilience of the tropical environment was evident in the form of coppicing and natural regeneration of plant species reminiscent of the Upper Guinean biome, including timber and NTFPs such as medicinal plants, fruits, poles and fiber. Some exotic species and other plant species indicative of disturbance and nutrient poor soils are also thriving. Wildlife was noticeably absent.

*Environmental Impact of IDPs beyond camp boundaries:*

- 6.17 The limited camp boundaries had forced IDPs to exploit valuable natural resources on land beyond the bounds of the camp. Resources known to have been exploited included those needed for shelter construction (poles, thatches, fiber), domestic energy needs, and income generation (fire wood and charcoal) opportunities. The demand for domestic energy was reported to be high in most former camps, and there were reported cases of people travelling long distances to obtain them because of their depletion in the vicinity of the former camps. No efforts had been made for the establishment of woodlots and only a few individuals were engaged in the use of energy efficient stoves such as eco-stoves.

---

<sup>8</sup> They included species such as *Mimosa pudica*, *Eleusine indica* and *Sporobolus pyramidalis*, and exotic species that take advantage of disturbance such as *Alternanthera brasiliana* and *Chromolaena odoratum*.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

*Impact of relief delivery on roads and bridges*

- 6.18 The delivery of relief to IDPs by vehicles transporting relief items was observed to have had a limited impact. For example, in Jah Tondo, Children's Home, Blamacee, Salala and Conneh camps, roads and concrete/metallic culverts had been damaged due to the frequency of use by the relief trucks and light vehicles.

**7 - RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Role of clusters*

- 7.1 The following recommendations are premised on the understanding that they will be taken forward by cluster lead agencies with the full engagement of the Government. The clusters are led by UN agencies which are accountable to the Humanitarian Coordinator for all activities falling within their cluster-area. Furthermore, it is understood that the implementation of recommendations may be taken forward by other UN agencies, NGOs, and Government institutions.
- 7.2 The recommendations address concerns in the former camps. Concerns identified in areas of return will be addressed through ongoing community-based reintegration programmes.
- 7.3 Specific emphasis should be laid on mobilising communities and developing leadership skills in view of the general dependency of the population, which was observed by the assessment team. This should aim to address protection, basic facilities, and environmental concerns by involving local authorities and community leadership in making decisions and implementing recommendations.

*Protection*

- 7.4 Consider providing return package to the individuals whose names were deleted from the WFP log. This would require also careful sensitisation or information campaign. The return package should include food, NFIs and trucking to areas of return, as well as ambulances for the sick. No transportation allowance will be given this time, and distribution may even take place at transit centres in return areas. Trucks to be provided by UNHCR and GTZ. This exercise should be preceded by a verification of persons who remain in the closed camps and who were at one stage deleted from the log.  
**Camp management and protection clusters (UNHCR) Food cluster (WFP)**
- 7.5 Individual counselling for persons identified with special needs to jointly review their options with them and the community, and to put in place individual plans that address their long-term survival. Plans to address the concerns of persons with special needs should prioritise the registered cases. In some individual cases, it may be necessary to provide some *ad hoc* support such as emergency medical care, psycho-social counselling, family tracing, and travel arrangements. Observations from this counselling exercise should feed into the development of community mobilisation/leadership

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

programmes mentioned above under 'general recommendations'. **Protection cluster (UNHCR)**

- 7.6 Advocate for the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, and the Ministry of Gender to take the lead in addressing the needs of persons with special needs. **Protection cluster (UNHCR) Health cluster (WHO)**
- 7.7 Make shelter programmes available to persons with special needs, particularly in Lofa, Gbarpolu, and Bomi Counties. **Emergency shelter cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.8 Continue to support protection monitoring activities. **Protection cluster (UNHCR)**

*Property*

- 7.9 Support the Government and community to address mediate between camp population and landlord/local community in locations where there is potential for tensions to arise or where there are prospects for persons with special needs to be evicted. Consider the option of formal agreements for land use. **Protection cluster (UNHCR)**

*Basic services*

- 7.10 These recommendations should address absence of basic services, which is likely to seriously affect the health of the population. Notwithstanding the concerns highlighted above, implementation of these recommendations should be not be implemented in such a way as to create the perception that the population is being serviced as a camp.
- 7.11 As part of their overall community-based recovery program, sector agencies should look into the possibility of providing WATSAN facilities at the locations where these facilities are absent. In the event of this taking place, the former camps and the nearby communities should be targeted as a whole. The facilities should be situated in the communities rather than in the former camps so as not to appear as if the former camps are being re-built. This approach will give a sense of ownership and responsibility to the communities which would make maintenance of the facilities more durable. Facilities to include: limited number of family latrines, wells with hand pumps, garbage pits. **Water and sanitation cluster (UNICEF)**

*Education*

- 7.12 Rehabilitate educational facilities in locations where a significant population has remained and where the local community is also deprived of primary education facilities (Perry, Ricks and Brown's Town). **Education sector (UNICEF)**

*Environment*

- 7.13 Based on the key findings, the following actions are recommended to ensure that the ecological integrity of the land is restored, and its associated string of benefits for the socio-economic development of the communities and affected landlords are realized. The actions proposed hold for all former camps, except where recommendations explicitly mention certain sites.

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

- 7.14 The timeframe for accomplishing the recommendations will range from 6-24 months; 6 months for clean up and sealing of wells; 12 months for backfilling of toilets and monitoring for subsequent backfilling; 12-18 months for raising seedlings in the nursery and an additional 6 months for transplanting in the field; environmental awareness will cover 24 month duration.
- 7.15 Back-fill all open latrines and garbage pits and monitor them for a period of 12 months for the purposes of refilling should they sink considerably. This action should be carried out immediately and should involve the participation of landlords, environmental and water and sanitation NGOs, and relevant Government agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.16 Clean all open wells and properly seal them with concrete if they are not intended for re-use by the community. Re-enforce the concrete slabs around those currently in use and showing cracks to prevent seepage of pollutants. Undertake as a matter of urgency and involve landlords, communities and organizations dealing with environment and sanitation issues as well as the relevant government and development agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.17 Ensure the proper collection, sorting and disposal of non-degradable and toxic materials through proper training, monitoring and provision of tools. This should be carried out immediately for at least 6 months duration to prevent them from being washed into nearby streams and should involve landlords, environmental and sanitation NGOs, and other relevant government agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.18 Demolish all abandoned and unwanted structures and shelters and ensure construction wastes/materials such as rusty nails are properly disposed of. This should be carried out immediately and involve landlords, communities and other interested agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.19 Re-condition a limited number of latrines for use by IDPs to prevent defecation in the open. **Water and sanitation cluster (UNICEF)**
- 7.20 Create environmental awareness among IDPs and communities, and by introducing and supporting fuel-efficient stoves (eco-stoves). This should be undertaken immediately and should involve all relevant environmental NGOs and interested agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.21 Ensure toilet slabs intended for re-use by landlords and communities are properly treated with limestone and awareness created about the negative impact. Undertake immediately and involve landlords, communities, local environmental and sanitation NGOs. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.22 Back-fill erosion gullies and control further erosion through appropriate remediation measures. Carry out immediately and monitor for a period of 12 months, and involve landlords, communities, environmental, and agricultural agencies. **Camp management cluster (UNHCR)**
- 7.23 Establish tree nurseries comprising of economic crops and fast growing fuel wood species desired by landlords for rehabilitation of the land. Start immediately and monitor for 12 months and involve landlords, communities,

**DRAFT REPORT**  
**13 June 2006**

environmental, and agricultural NGOs and relevant government agencies.  
***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***

- 7.24 Establish woodlots of fast growing tree species on heavily compacted soils as an initial step in reclaiming and restoring the nutrient status of these sites. Undertake immediately and monitor for a period of 18 months and involve landlords and environmental NGOs and relevant government agencies.  
***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***
- 7.25 Promote and support diversified income-generating activities that are environmentally friendly. Involve local development and environmental NGOs and government agencies. ***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***
- 7.26 Provide seeds and tools for vegetable production on house spots and inter-crop with economic trees as a beginning point for land rehabilitation. Begin immediately and monitor for 12 months and involve landlords, IDPs, environmental, and agricultural NGOs. ***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***
- 7.27 Provide assistance for demarcation and erection of cornerstones at Basaymah to prevent land disputes following departure of IDPs. Conduct this immediately and involve all landlords, local authorities and LRRRC. ***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***
- 7.28 Clean polluted stream in Maimu I. Immediate to long-term and involve landlord, communities, environmental and sanitation NGOs. ***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***
- 7.29 Recondition roads and bridges damaged due to heavy use by relief vehicles. Immediate to short term and involve landlord, government agencies, etc. ***Camp management cluster (UNHCR)***

13 June 2006  
Monrovia, Liberia

**8. List of Appendices**

**Appendix I** – List of participating agencies

**Appendix II** – Camp assessment schedule

**Appendix III** - Table showing original and current population per camp. The current population figure is further aggregated into 2 groups corresponding to the status of people still living in the camp i.e., *Assisted and Non-assisted*. The figures for the current total population are presented in a descending order with the camp having the highest number coming first.

**Appendix IV** – Table showing original and current population per camp. It also shows the percentage of registered IDPs still staying in the camp.

**Appendix V** - Table showing original and current population. It also shows the percentage of total number of people staying in the camp.

**Appendix VI** - Table showing the main Counties and Districts of Origin of the remaining population

**Appendix VII** – Table showing the various categories of people with special needs.

**Appendix VIII** – Table showing the original and current number of shelters. It also indicates whether a shelter is occupied or abandoned

**Appendix IX** - Table showing original and current number of shelters as well as the percentage of the occupied shelters.

**Appendix X** – Table showing original and current figures of basic facilities in the former various camps

**Appendix XI** – Table presenting the indicative cost for environmental rehabilitation of former camps

**Appendix XII** – Information on specific environmental conditions

**Appendix XIII** – Methodology

**Appendix XIV** – Description of 2004 verification exercise

**Appendix XV** - Acronyms