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Samuel Hall. (www.samuelhall.org) is a research and consulting company with headquarters in Kabul, Afghanistan. We specialise in socio-economic surveys, private and public sector studies, monitoring and evaluation and impact assessments for governmental, non-governmental and international organisations. Our teams of field practitioners, academic experts and local interviewers have years of experience leading research in Afghanistan. We use our expertise to balance needs of beneficiaries with the requirements of development actors. This has enabled us to acquire a firm grasp of the political and socio-cultural context in the country; design data collection methods and statistical analyses for monitoring, evaluating, and planning sustainable programmes and to apply cross-disciplinary knowledge in providing integrated solutions for efficient and effective interventions.

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC, http://www.nrc.no) is an independent, humanitarian, non-profit, non-governmental organisation, established in 1946. NRC works to protect the rights of displaced and vulnerable persons during crisis. Through our programmes we provide assistance to meet immediate humanitarian needs, prevent further displacement and contribute to durable solutions. Through our advocacy we strive for rights to be upheld and for lasting solutions to be achieved. Through our stand-by rosters we provide expertise as a strategic partner to the UN, as well as to national and international actors.

The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC, http://www.internal-displacement.org/) was established by the Norwegian Refugee Council in 1998 and aims to support better international and national responses to situations of international displacement and respect for the rights of internally displaced person (IDPs), many of whom are among the world’s most vulnerable people. It also aims to promote durable solutions for IDPs, through return, local integration or settlement elsewhere in the country.

The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS, www.jips.org) is an inter-agency service set up to provide support to profiling exercises of displacement situations. It responds to requests for support in planning and implementing profiling and advocates for the benefits of profiling at the global level. JIPS also facilitates field-to-field experience sharing through the database of the Profiling and Assessment Resource Kit (PARK, www.parkdatabase.org) and the dissemination of profiling tools and good practices. JIPS is supervised by a Steering Committee bringing together the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), NRC-IDMC, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The service is funded by AusAid, DRC, the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), NRC-IDMC and UNHCR.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIHRC</td>
<td>Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>MoLSAMD</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Martyrs and the Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Afghan Local Police</td>
<td>MoPH</td>
<td>Ministry of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDMA</td>
<td>Afghanistan National Disaster Management Authority</td>
<td>MoRR</td>
<td>Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDS</td>
<td>Afghanistan National Development Strategy</td>
<td>MoWA</td>
<td>Ministry of Women's Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSF</td>
<td>Afghan National Security Forces</td>
<td>MRRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSO</td>
<td>Afghan NGO Security Office</td>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOG</td>
<td>Armed Opposition Groups</td>
<td>NDMC</td>
<td>National Disaster Management Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Afghanistan Protection Cluster</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>Non-food Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWECC</td>
<td>Afghan Women's Educational Centre</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>National Priority Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Community Development Council</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAN</td>
<td>Child Protection Action Network</td>
<td>NRVA</td>
<td>National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWGER</td>
<td>Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACCAR</td>
<td>Danish Committee for Aid to Afghan Refugees</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Swedish Committee for Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Danish Demining Group</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Swedish Committee for Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoRR</td>
<td>Department of Refugees and Repatriation</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>TLO</td>
<td>The Liaison Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESNFi</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Item</td>
<td>UNDSS</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVI</td>
<td>Extremely Vulnerable Individuals</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>Food Security and Agriculture Cluster</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based Violence</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>Housing, Land and Property</td>
<td>VAW</td>
<td>Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
<td>WaSH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLA</td>
<td>Information, Counselling and Legal Aid</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person / People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>International Medical Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Military Forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAF</td>
<td>International Security Assistance Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIN</td>
<td>Integrated Regional Information Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIPS</td>
<td>Joint IDP Profiling Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Land Allocation Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research study on the protection of internally displaced persons in Afghanistan
Executive summary

This report – based on research from Samuel Hall Consulting and commissioned by the Norwegian Refugee Council – provides the first systematic overview of protection of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Afghanistan. It combines the voices of IDPs with analysis of the decision-making processes shaping responses to internal displacement. The authors show that internal displacement is not a merely humanitarian ‘problem’ but should be just as much the concern of those in the development community. Recommendations are offered to help the Government of Afghanistan develop a national IDP policy.

Prolonged and recent displacement

A 2009 survey concluded that 76% of Afghans have experienced displacement. The majority of those displaced (or multiply displaced) by decades of conflict have not returned to their place of origin. They generally lead perilous lives in urban areas as they seek to survive in the informal economy. IDPs, especially women and children, are exposed to multiple protection risks. To their number have recently been added newly displaced caseloads, people whose flight is due to the steady spread of conflict and generalised insecurity into areas hitherto relatively peaceful. The number of civilian casualties has been on the rise since 2007. The total population displaced by conflict grew by 45% between 2010 and 2011. A third of all those displaced today fled their homes in 2012. In October 2012, the number of IDPs has reached over half a million individuals. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated the number of conflict-induced IDPs alone in Afghanistan substantially exceeded 400,000. This is a conservative figure that does not capture IDPs scattered in urban areas, those displaced by natural disasters, nor IDPs not accessible due to security reasons. Neither does it capture all those who do not necessarily self-identify as IDPs but whose struggles for livelihoods are made even harder by the fact they are have faced the enormous shock of displacement and years of disappointment stuck in prolonged displacement, unable to climb out of chronic poverty.
The study builds upon existing research with new information collected through an extensive quantitative and qualitative survey of over a thousand IDP households in five provinces (Kabul and Nangahar in the east, the southern province of Kandahar, the western province of Herat and Faryab in the north-west). Evidence from individual and household studies shows the range of protection violations from which IDPs may suffer and what it means to be an IDP in Afghanistan.

Challenging misunderstandings

The report presents evidence to show how government responses have often been shaped by erroneous assumptions. It refutes such widespread misconceptions by confirming through evidenced-based research, that:

- While difficult, it is possible to distinguish between an IDP and an urban migrant.
- There are both long-term and short-term IDPs and those who have been displaced for years are not better-off than the newly displaced.
- IDPs are not limited to displaced sedentary populations but includes nomadic groups traditionally following pastoral-based lifestyles whose livelihoods have been disrupted by conflict, such as Kuchi.
- Most IDPs would prefer to integrate locally and not return to their rural homes.

Many stakeholders use a definition of IDP linked to duration and place a time limit on internal displacement. This interpretation neither fits the situation on the ground, nor the universally applicable requirements defined by the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the Framework for Durable Solutions. The Framework clarifies that a truly durable solution is “a long-term process of gradually diminishing displacement-specific needs” that does not occur at one point in time and which leads to one of the three durable solutions (local integration, resettlement and return).

Key Findings

- Over half of IDPs interviewed identified the Taliban and other anti-government elements as primarily responsible for their displacement.
- There are multiple kinds of other (much less acknowledged) conflicts – typically inter-tribal, ethnic or resource-driven – which trigger displacement.
Natural disasters (droughts, floods, avalanches and earthquakes) were cited as the primary trigger of displacement by 17% of respondents.

Wherever they are found, and regardless of gender or length of displacement, IDPs indicated their three major protection priorities are employment, food and water and housing.

Over three quarters report they hope to settle permanently in their current location. The desire to return ‘home’ reduces steadily over time: the longer families are displaced, the less interested they are in returning.

Approximately 90% of IDPs interviewed qualify as extremely vulnerable individuals (EVI) as they meet one or more criteria established by UNHCR to indicate those whose socio-economic profiles place them not only below national averages but also at risk of living in life-threatening conditions.

IDPs are worse off than the rest of the population. The illiteracy rate for both IDP men and women is above national averages. IDPs live in larger households (9.5 people) than other Afghans (7.3) but have lower household incomes.

Unemployment rates for IDPs are well below national averages and increase with length of displacement. Due to post-displacement difficulties in securing employment the IDP households surveyed have seen their monthly incomes decrease by 21%.

The majority of IDP households spend over three quarters of their income on food, with over half spending above 90%. Over a third had not eaten for several days prior to being surveyed. IDPs who were displaced in 2012 report the same nutritional deficiencies as those displaced 10 years ago.

Water is in short supply, of low quality and often the cause of disputes with members of host communities and other IDPs.

More than a third of IDP children lack access to education. IDPs complained their children are often unwelcome in school and that teachers and non-displaced students tease children whose families are unable to buy them shoes, schoolbooks and stationery.

IDPs generally have positive relationships with their immediate host communities but feel unwelcomed by authorities.

Less than a tenth of IDPs have received employment or housing-related assistance, compared to the two fifths who have received emergency food, water or transportation aid.

There is significant geographical discrepancy in IDPs’ likelihood of receiving assistance: those in Kabul are over eight times more likely to have received aid than IDPs in Kandahar.

Women’s vulnerabilities increase further as a result of displacement, particularly widows whose incomes are significantly less than those of other IDPs.

**Employment and livelihoods**

On average, household income decreased by 21% as a result of internal displacement. 62% of surveyed IDPs stated that employment-related issues were their main problems during displacement. After being displaced, IDPs typically move away from agriculture to construction and other day-labour in the informal sector. IDPs enter urban areas – often after suffering the losses associated with displacement, including those of assets and social networks spanning generations – at a unique disadvantage. Women from rural origins, no longer with the opportunity to do farming work and denied jobs in the male-dominated construction sector, are forced into perilous dependence on irregular tailoring, sewing or begging. Though many IDPs seek to diversify income, they often lack means to purchase equipment or access capital. Trapped in the informal economy, IDPs become more dependent than the non-displaced on daily labour that is usually badly paid, temporary and insecure.

Household circumstances generally do not improve: prolonged IDPs reported a higher rate of unemployment than more recent IDPs. Researchers found that an average of only 1.12 individuals were contributing to the respondents’ monthly household income, typically relying heavily on a single individual to meet all of the household’s economic needs. Rural IDP households earn significantly more than urban households. This suggests high levels of irregular and insufficient employment in urban areas and that urban IDPs’ motivations in remaining in the city are primarily driven by the desire to find security and are unrelated to economic or employment opportunities.

Without sufficient employment opportunities, over 90% of IDPs reported having had to borrow money for basic needs after being displaced. Over 30% of IDPs reported borrowing money at least six times in the previous year to buy food.

Those IDPs who have received livelihoods-related assistance from the humanitarian community are critical of its temporary nature. The International Labour Organisation has noted that “most jobs that have been generated by the international development assistance tend to be casual or temporary and are clearly not sustainable without continuing aid inflows.” IDPs reported lack of transparency in the selection of IDP beneficiaries. Lack of a proper methodology to conduct pre-assessments led to incomplete surveys, leaving some IDP households excluded. This often results in jealousy and internal tensions within beneficiary communities.
Many IDP children are engaged in street vending, scavenging plastic bags and washing cars. Children working in urban areas are particularly susceptible to violence, kidnapping and car accidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gendered Vulnerabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Women’s vulnerabilities increase further after displacement, particularly for widows who made up a fifth of our total female respondents. Employed male IDPs earn, on average, 4.3 times more than females. When one considers the markedly lower rate of female economic participation it is apparent that surveyed IDP males earned between 23 and 47 times more than female IDPs. Displaced women are more likely to be socially isolated and to lack traditional protective mechanisms. Displaced women and girls’ increased economic vulnerabilities place them at a higher risk of prostitution and forced marriages.

Field observations show linkages between displacement and forced and early marriages. IDPs may rely on dowries as a source of household income to meet their basic needs. The survey showed that at least one child had been forced to marry in almost a third of IDP households. This is especially the case for female-headed households. Several women noted they felt their daughters were targeted for low-cost marriage by outsiders who had heard that poor IDPs would accept low levels of dowry. Overall, 27% of female children were reportedly forced to marry against their wills.

Only 18% of IDP women have a national ID card (tazkera) (as opposed to 83% of men) – a factor contributing to their low level of engagement in elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing, land and property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Of IDPs interviewed, the number of households that owned their dwelling dropped significantly, from 70% pre-displacement to 26% with only 21% holding a legal record of their ownership. IDPs arrive in places of refuge with few resources, typically lacking the financial resources and social networks to live anywhere but in tents and cramped, insubstantial mud homes. Respondents who were displaced before the fall of the Taliban in 2001 were no more likely to own land than those who were displaced between the end of 2001 and 2009. Because they often illegally occupy private or government owned land, IDPs are sometimes threatened by evictions, whether lawful or otherwise. Many choose to live in informal camp-like settlements on state land in the belief their high visibility will reduce threats of eviction.

Of the IDPs sampled, 44% had built their dwellings without assistance. Often IDPs –especially in female-headed households – lack skills and build precarious structures, often being forced to re-build with each passing rainstorm. Dwellings offer little protection against the cold: during the winter of 2011-12 over a hundred IDP infants and children in informal settlements in Kabul died of cold. Privacy is limited, and girls and boys – sometimes distant relatives – are forced to sleep in the same room, thus violating opposing traditional social mores. Lack of space and living in cramped circumstances can increase the risks of violence against women.
Poor coordination and information sharing

Detailed analysis of response mechanisms indicated that:

- There is no forum in which information collected for programmatic interventions can be shared.
- Links between Kabul and field offices of many organisations appear to be either weak or excessively centralised.
- While many actors have collected field information, only recently has the practice of collecting and sharing information become a joint activity; thus, IDP profiling is unable to provide a composite nationwide overview.
- Information collected is generally fed into individual agencies’ systems rather than analysed to forecast potential protection concerns that fall beyond food security, shelter and non-food items.
- It is challenging to obtain verified and evidence-based information about beneficiaries. Division of responsibilities over conflict-induced IDPs and natural disaster-induced IDPs, between UNHCR and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) means there is no single source providing cumulative information on total numbers of IDPs.
- There is considerable variation in the way that actors (in Kabul and the field) understand what protection of IDPs means.
- Information provided typically involves numbers of IDPs without sufficient additional disaggregated information to permit informed decisions on protection issues, especially of vulnerable groups such as women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities.
- Once the first stage of emergency assistance is over, coordination between agencies becomes blurred and follow-up referrals and support minimal.
- The roles of the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation (MoRR) and the Afghanistan National Disaster Management Authority (ANDMA) are poorly demarcated: it is often unclear how they relate to each other, to other government ministries and to provincial governors.
- Though MoRR and ANDMA are part of the IDP Task Force that coordinates emergency response for conflict and natural disaster-induced IDPs at provincial level they are often, in practice, merely passive participants.
- Efforts by humanitarian actors to boost the capacity of MoRR are yet to yield concrete results: civil servants still do not see issues such as VAW and exploitation of IDP children as matters of concern within their remit.
- Unavailability or inadequacy of protection information prevents many agencies from making convincing fundraising appeals to donors to support protection programmes.

10-year-old Fatima and her cousin Mahboba collect water from a river near their shelter in Herat Province, Western Afghanistan.

(Photo: NRC/Farzana Wahidy, June 2012)
Afghan NGOs and dilemmas of remote management

In recent years, national NGOs (NNGOs) have begun filling the vacuum created by shrinking humanitarian space for international humanitarians. Researchers found their field staff generally have a poor grasp of what protection concretely means. Many cannot distinguish between a traditional humanitarian organisation adhering to humanitarian principles and a civil-military contractor. NNGOs are not bound by mandates and are willing to implement military-funded humanitarian and development projects without necessarily understanding the risks entailed. Often, such decisions are driven by cost-benefit analysis, a strategy to survive by contracting to deliver specified services.

Remote management via poorly trained staff of NNGOs raises key questions:
- Is it possible to provide humanitarian assistance to IDPs without direct contact with beneficiaries?
- Is it desirable if organisations cannot monitor and check the impact of their actions and interventions?
- Is it ethical to transfer security risks to NGO staff who often take risks that others are not willing to take?

Informing a national IDP policy

The report’s evidence-based recommendations come at an opportune time. Afghanistan lacks a national policy on internal displacement. Researchers found many provincial decision-makers to be confused about if and how to respond to displacement and in need of guidance. Afghanistan has accepted the applicability of The Guiding Principles. In July 2012, MoRR launched a National IDP Policy process. Still in its infancy, this should provide an opportunity for stakeholders to develop a national policy in conformity with international best practice.

Policy guidance is urgently required. Many analysts predict no let-up in the accelerating level of new displacement. The two major destinations for Afghan migrants and refugees for decades – Iran and Pakistan – appear less of an option for the recently displaced. With IDP numbers set to rise further there is fear – at a time of transition as international military forces prepare for withdrawal – that post-transition international funding for IDP support programmes may be sharply reduced.

The report urges all stakeholders (including IDPs, NNGOs, community representatives, IDP leaders, civil servants and politicians) to work together to draft a comprehensive national policy which – if approved and implemented – would go a considerable way towards creating a transparent, more predictable, better-informed programme planning process. A range of international actors (including NRC) are strong supporters of this initiative. The findings of this study should inform the emerging national policy.
Recommendations

This chapter draws together the IDP Protection Study’s key findings and conclusions and makes a range of recommendations to address the major protection challenges faced by Afghan IDPs.

Recommendations are structured as follows:

I. Recommendations to the Government of Afghanistan, aimed at informing the on-going development of the National IDP Policy

II. Recommendations to the Government of Afghanistan, the United Nations and other humanitarian and development actors, aimed at strengthening responses to key displacement-specific protection concerns.

III. Recommendations to key national and international protection actors, aimed at improving analysis of IDPs’ needs and strengthening coordination and response.

A number of the recommendations outlined were developed and discussed at an inter-agency workshop hosted by the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation on July 18, 2012 in Kabul and attended by key IDP protection actors in Afghanistan (Annex 3).

I. On the development of the National IDP Policy

To the Government of Afghanistan

- Consult widely with IDPs during development of the policy and subsequent adoption and implementation.
- Ensure active engagement of all line ministries in development of the policy by assigning institutional focal points on internal displacement tasked with contributing to relevant areas.
- Establish an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism on IDPs led by MoRR. To address the lack of inter-ministerial coordination, establish a forum through which key line ministries can ensure the effective coordination of current government programmes relevant to IDPs
- Adopt an IDP definition based on the internationally recognised definition set out in the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, while taking into account the complexity of differentiating IDPs from other vulnerable groups with closely related similar vulnerabilities and needs.
- Focus on and address the key displacement-specific needs of IDPs. As identified above, these relate to livelihoods, access to food and water and housing, land and property.
- Promote the full range of durable solutions and agree measures for assessing when displacement ends in line with international standards, including the UN Guiding Principles and the Framework on Durable Solutions. All settlement options must be left open and IDPs must be informed about the full range of options, including local integration and resettlement as well as return to their homes or communities of origin.
- Prioritise the most vulnerable IDPs regardless of the duration of their displacement. Ensure that the rights, needs and vulnerabilities of IDPs are clearly identified in the emerging national policy and that assistance and protection is guaranteed on the basis of agreed definitions of Extremely Vulnerable Individuals.
- Commit to conducting outreach activities and undertake measures to raise awareness across Afghan society about the existence of IDPs and the nature of internal displacement.
- Ensure that IDPs themselves are also aware of their rights.
- Invest in building the capacity of DoRR. Provincial DoRR staff will need to be trained periodically on protection and the human rights of IDPs and to be sensitised to the conceptual and operational planning issues related to IDP assistance.
- Safeguard humanitarian principles and guarantee access by humanitarian organisations to IDPs and safe, unimpeded access by IDPs to humanitarian assistance. The National IDP Policy should enshrine humanitarian principles of independence, neutrality and impartiality and ensure these are clearly related to the role of humanitarian actors in protecting the right of IDPs to access assistance.

II. On improving responses to key displacement-specific protection concerns

To the Government of Afghanistan, the United Nations and other humanitarian and development actors

Employment and Livelihoods

- Prioritise early recovery programmes for IDPs focusing on interventions supporting income-generation and livelihood activities which are adapted to local contexts.
Identify longer-term vocational training programmes for IDPs. Develop and implement a pilot project to provide long-term vocational training for IDPs with a view to assessing the viability and sustainability of such initiatives to address IDPs’ livelihood insecurity.

Support IDPs to develop linkages to employers based on skills taught or existing skills. Develop and implement a pilot project to provide long-term vocational training for IDPs with a view to assessing their viability.

Support IDPs to develop needed pre-employment skills by implementing adult literacy and vocational training programmes in order to assist IDPs access the labour market.

Implement programmes aimed at bridging the gaps between IDPs’ existing skills and those required to enter the labour market in their place of displacement. These should include vocational training to permit IDPs to learn skills while marketing products or services.

Develop targeted livelihood programmes for women designed to improve livelihoods and food security: such initiatives might include improved poultry raising and market gardening.

Food / Water

Take steps to ensure that needs for emergency food and potable water are immediately met within the initial phase of displacement.

Prioritise post-emergency implementation of food-for-training and food-for-education programmes in order to better link responses to the related problems of unemployment and food insecurity.

Encourage the government to establish a food and nutrition secretariat to ensure that this key protection priority of IDPs is addressed systematically in a coordinated manner.

National and municipal authorities should take concrete steps to promote more sustainable water provision and to ensure availability of safe and affordable water in camps and other sites on government-owned land.

Housing, Land and Property

Review Presidential Decree 104 with a view to ensuring the future eligibility of IDPs (in their province of displacement and not just of origin) for the Land Allocation Scheme (LAS).

Take pro-active measures to ensure inclusion of women’s rights to housing, land and property in all land and shelter programmes.

Gender-based Violence

Conduct further research into linkages between displacement and gender-based violence so as to inform improved GBV programming for IDPs.
ernment and humanitarian and development actors to support programmes targeting the needs both of IDPs and host communities.

III. On improving analysis of IDPs’ needs and strengthening coordination and response

To the Government of Afghanistan, the United Nations, other humanitarian and development actors and donors

Develop consensus on key definitions and needs
- The Afghanistan Humanitarian Country Team should request a comprehensive IDP profiling exercise. This should provide disaggregated information on the causes and patterns of displacement, conditions during displacement, protection needs and intentions for durable solutions.
- MoRR should establish a national system for the collection of data, disaggregated by age, gender and other key indicators. Compiling basic data on internal displacement should help foster consensus, coordinated planning and response and national responsibility.

Strengthen coordination to improve IDP response through enhanced IDP Task Forces
- Develop a strategy to build the capacity of IDP Task Forces at the provincial and district levels. Particular attention should be given to ensuring an effective role in coordinating IDP profiling, monitoring and response.
- Address barriers to effective participation of UN agencies, NGO and provincial authorities at IDP Task Force meetings. This may entail investing in dedicated DoRR coordinators, building their capacity and ensuring translation support is available.
- Expand the membership of IDP Task Forces so as to ensure they are more representative of all actors involved directly and indirectly in IDP assistance: these may include local and municipal authorities, governors’ offices and provincial offices of ministries.

Use the IDP Task Force to improve protection assessments
- Support IDP Task Forces to institute a capacity-building programme to support protection mainstreaming designed to ensure that all response actors at regional and provincial level have improved awareness around a) the objectives of collecting information on protection issues and b) the methodologies and purposes of the assessment and data collection.
- Promote through IDP Task Forces the use of standardised tools and questionnaires in order to capture information on critical protection issues to inform improved referral processes.
- Train and sensitise IDP Task Force member agencies on protection priorities specific to IDPs and ensure initial rapid and joint assessments are followed up with routine site visits and needs assessments with stronger protection indicators.

Enhance delivery of IDP programmes and assistance: operationalise response
- Clearly define, at national and provincial level, MoRR’s role and relationships with other government actors (line ministries, provincial governors and municipalities and ANDMA). It is particularly important to define MoRR’s operational coordination and assistance function so that it may better contribute to national humanitarian responses.
- Encourage international development actors (such as the UN Development Programme) to support and participate in the national IDP Task Force in order to ensure targeted early recovery programme support to IDPs is available wherever necessary.
- Strengthen early warning systems and social safety nets for IDPs by means of better work linkages between MoRR and other relevant government ministries and agencies. This is particularly important in food insecure or disaster-prone areas which require a dual displacement prevention and harm mitigation policy.
- Promote through the national IDP Task Force the facilitation of emergency responses to reported IDP caseloads. When assessment and assistance during the initial phase of displacement does not occur the IDP Task Force needs to identify the reasons and address them immediately.
- Task IDP Task Forces with ensuring effective and practical follow-up on the delivery of assistance. It is essential to assess whether vulnerabilities have been addressed through instituting a clear referral framework system linked to ongoing monitoring.
- The Afghanistan Humanitarian Country Team should support efforts to help expand humanitarian access for actors seeking to meet the emergency needs of all IDPs and displacement-affected communities in insecure or inaccessible areas. This should include encouraging all parties to the conflict to respect humanitarian principles and promote safe, unimpeded and timely access for humanitarian actors so as to ensure unmet humanitarian needs of IDPs are effectively addressed.
Undertake further research to address knowledge gaps

- Provide an improved evidence base for practitioners and policy makers on internal displacement in Afghanistan. Further research is needed to fill the key knowledge gaps identified by this study and inform improved programming for IDPs during all phases of displacement. Research should particularly focus on:
  - gender-based violence before and during displacement, including female exploitation
  - specific displacement-related vulnerabilities for IDP youth populations and related child protection risks
  - specific displacement-related vulnerabilities faced by older persons and those with disabilities
  - IDPs’ nutritional status and access to quality health services
  - socio-economic profiling of IDPs during displacement and on return.

Notes

5 Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), 2010, Framework on durable solutions for internally displaced persons.