

ES/NFI CLUSTER RAPID ASSESSMENT MECHANISM

AFGHANISTAN - JAWZJAN PROVINCE SHIBERGHAN DISTRICT - GHORA



December 2021

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

Following over 40 years of conflict, displacement, and natural disaster, Afghanistan remains one of the most extensive humanitarian crises, with 24.4 million people in need of humanitarian assistance. Of these, 10.9 million people are likely to be in severe or extreme need of shelter and/ or non-food items (NFI) assistance. To improve local responsiveness to support in-need populations in Afghanistan, the Emergency Shelter and NFI (ES/NFI) cluster launched a Rapid Assessment Mechanism (RAM) in 2021 to conduct rapid assessments among settlements across Afghanistan. Through the mechanism, ES/NFI Cluster Regional Focal Points identify potential caseloads and negotiate access to the locations, while key cluster partners in the province collect the data. The data is then cleaned and analysed by REACH before being presented in factsheet form.

Coordinated by ES/NFI Cluster Regional Focal Points, ES/NFI Partner Save the Children conducted data collection in and around Ghora settlement between 30 November and 6 December. Using a standardised Household Kobo Tool, a total of 76 household interviews were conducted from a population size of 280 households. All findings are indicative and should not be taken to be generalisable to the entire population. The following factsheet presents key findings of the data from the assessment, including demographics, shelter needs, and cross-cutting shelter concerns.



DEMOGRAPHICS

Reported household composition, disaggregated by age and gender:

.

| Male 🛉 | 41% | Total | 59% | 🛊 Female |
|--------|-----|-------|------|----------|
| | 2% | 60+ | 3% I | |
| | 15% | 18-59 | 19% | |
| | 15% | 6-17 | 23% | |
| | 10% | 0-5 | 14% | |

Households surveyed reported the following displacement statuses:

| Internally displaced persons (IDPs) | Returnees | Prolonged IDPs ² |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| 34% | 0% | 4% |
| Host | Migrants | Protracted IDPs ³ |
| 62 % | 0% | 0% |

Key demographics of the interviewed households:

| Average household size | Female-headed households | Older-persons headed households |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 8 | 13% | 15% |

7→ DISPLACEMENT



100% of displaced households reported that their current displacement was the first time that a majority of their household members had been displaced.

% of households reporting having been negatively affected by the following major shocks in the three months prior to data collection:⁴

| Active conflict or violence | 63% | |
|----------------------------------|-----|--|
| Drought | 46% | |
| Anticipated conflict or violence | 28% | |

% of households by reported movement intentions in the 3 months following data collection:





average number of times IDP households that reported being displaced more than once reported that they had been displaced.

- 1. UNOCHA, Humanitarian Needs Overview 2022: Afghanistan, January 2022
- 2. IDPs who reported to having stayed in the host community for 2 to 24 months were considered 'Prolonged'.
- IDPs who reported to having stayed in the host community for longer than 24 months were considered 'Protracted'.
- 4. Respondents could select multiple responses.
- 5. ES/NFI Cluster vulnerability criteria included are marked by footnotes below.
- 6. Households were considered vulnerable if the head of household reported any type of disability.
- 7. Households were considered vulnerable if they reported being female headed or headed by someone under the age of 18, and had no adult male members.
- 8. Households were considered vulnerable if anyone other than the head of household had a disability.
 9. The ratio is calculated by dividing the total number of household members by able-bodied and working adult men and women. A household was considered vulnerable if the score was 8 or more.
- 10. A shelter was considered damaged if one or more than one section or element had been affected to a certain level which could potentially affect living conditions of the residents.







Ci

VULNERABILITY

Reported household vulnerability score, according to ES/NFI Cluster criteria.⁵

26% Vulnerable 74% Not Vulnerable

The overall vulnerability of each household was calculated based on 11 key vulnerability criteria defined by the ES/NFI cluster. For each criteria, if the household met the criteria, a score between 0 and 3 was given, then added up, giving a total score between 0 and 24. A vulnerability category was then ascribed based on the following categories and scores: Not Vulnerable (0-8) and Vulnerable (9-16).

42%

of households reported that the head of household had a disability.⁶



3% of households were found to be headed by a female or child head of household without the presence of an adult male household member.⁷

33%

of households reported that one or more members of the household, not including the head of household, had a disability or chronic illness.⁸



43% of households were found to have a dependency ratio of 8 or more.⁹

SHELTER

% of households per shelter type of shelter:

| Permanent mud | 91% | Damaged shelter ¹⁰ | 0% |
|-----------------------|-----|-------------------------------|----|
| Permanent brick | 1% | Tent | 1% |
| Permanent fired brick | 1% | Makeshift shelter | 5% |
| Transitional shelter | 0% | Collective centre | 0% |
| Unfinished shelter | 0% | Open space (no shelter) | 0% |



22% of households reported living in open spaces, tents, or makeshift shelters.¹¹

% of households reporting their shelter having the following amenities:

| Separate bathroom space | 86% |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Separate kitchen space | 82% |
| Separate rooms for women | 32% |
| Separate space for livestock | 22% |

average number of rooms occupied by the household as reported by households. 12

70% of households reported that their shelter had been damaged since Ramadan 2021.¹³ Among those households, the main reported reasons for the damage were:

| Violence in the area | 68% | |
|----------------------|-----|--|
| Other ¹⁴ | 21% | |
| Natural disaster | 8% | |

Of the **6%** of households with a written or verbal accommodation agreement, **100%** reported that they could not afford to pay their rent on time.

14. The reported materials were considered of 'poor quality' if they were either unable to sustain for the

% of households per reported degree of shelter damage: 15

| 0% | Destroyed | | 3% | Severe | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-------|--------|-----------|
| 16% | Moderate | 53% | Minor | 29% | No damage |

71% of households reported that they had been unable to make repairs that they wanted to their shelters. Among these households, the top three reported reasons were:⁴

| Shelter materials are too expensive | 61% | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|
| Professional labour is too expensive | 44% | |
| professional_unavailable | 9% | |

100% of households reported not having sufficient NFIs. % of households by types of NFIs they reported possessing:¹⁶

| Mattress | 96% | Pots | 88% |
|------------------|-----|------------|-----|
| Water containers | 50% | Solar lamp | 5% |
| Shoes | 18% | Blanket | 67% |
| Caps | 8% | Fuel | 17% |
| Jackets | 18% | Tarpaulin | 0% |
| Gloves | 0% | | |

The average reported rent (in AFN) per household per month was found to be **10,667**.

100% of host community households that reported they were hosting other households in their shelter (**67%**) also reported that they were relatives of the households that they were hosting.

desired duration of time or could not function satisfactorily.



^{11.} Households were considered vulnerable if their shelter was reported to be a tent, a makeshift shelter, damaged shelter, collective centre, transitional shelter, an open space, or they had experienced an eviction

^{12.} The number of occupied rooms refers to only to living space.

^{13.} A shelter is considered damaged if one or more than one section or element has been affected to a certain level which can potentially affect living condition of the residents.

^{15.} The degree of shelter damage indicates the level of a shelter damage from physical perspective and defines how suitable it is for living.

^{16.} Households were asked if the following NFIs were owned in sufficient numbers (enough for each household member) by their household. If a household responded "no" to any of these NFIs, the household was considered as not having sufficient NFIs.



ACCOMMODATION



4% of households reported either being displaced and hosted by another household OR not being displaced and hosting other households in their shelter. 17

% of households by reported tenure status of their shelter:

| 90% | Owned |
|-----|------------|
| 5% | Don't know |
| 0% | Other |

| 0% | Squatting |
|----|-----------------|
| 4% | Insecure tenure |
| 1% | No answer |

% of households by reported accommodation arrangement:

| 66% | Own with documentation | 3% | Written agreement |
|-----|----------------------------|----|-------------------------------|
| 20% | Own without documentation | 3% | Verbal agreement |
| 3% | Staying with owner consent | 1% | Staying without owner consent |
| 1% | Other | 5% | No answer |



LIVELIHOODS

The average reported amount of household debt was found to be approximately 23,592 AFN.

The top three livelihood activities as reported by households were:

| Unskilled daily labour / no contract | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Skilled daily labour / no contract | |

Unemployed

4% of households reported not having any source of income/ livelihood.18

0% of households reported relying on taking debts, begging, or Zakat¹⁹ for their primary source of income.²⁰

11% of households reported that there were no working adult men or women in the household.21

74% of households reported relying on casual labour from only one household member for monthly income.²²



PRIORITY NEEDS

Top three most commonly reported shelter and NFI priorities for the winter period:

Cooking materials/kitchen materials

Heating materials / Fuel

Blankets and quilts

41%

40%

% of households by preferred modality of assistance:

In-kind

Most commonly reported main concerns about the current shelter.4

Damage shelter

Other

Shelter repair / insulation

Cash

Unable to afford to do repairs

Services

Mix

11%

PROTECTION

5% of households reported fears of eviction. Among these households, the most commonly reported reasons were:4

This land is privately owned

Disputes about rental price

Unable to pay rent

Weak/damaged/collapsed structure

Armed group violence/threats

them, the most commonly reported reasons for these fears were:4 47%

0% % of households reported that the doors on their shelter did not have locks.

% of households reporting having access to the following types of

22% of household reported not feeling safe in their shelter. Among



WASH

% of households by main reported water source:

| 46% | Hand pump | |
|-----|-------------|--|
| 0% | Pipe scheme | |

0% 1%

Kandas Protected spring

53%

Dug well

Family latrines household shelter

Soap in home

Water source within 500m of

WASH facilities:

99%

32%

17. Households were considered vulnerable if they were a host family hosting displaced households or a displaced household being hosted by a host family.

- Households were considered vulnerable if they reported no source of income.
- 19. Zakat is a charity that a person with specified amount of possessions has to give to others who qualify acceptance criteria.
- 20. Households were considered vulnerable if their main income sources were reported as borrowing
- money/taking on debt, remittances/gifts, selling personal belongings, or through a government pension. 21. Households were considered vulnerable if there were no adult men or adult working women in the household.
- 22. Households were considered vulnerable if they reported having only one working adult and casual labour was their only source of income.





