

# ZAMBIA

Joint WFP/UNHCR Needs Assessment  
**MANTAPALA SETTLEMENT**

## Brief

### BACKGROUND

In September 2020 the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) was hosting about 80,200 refugees in urban areas and in three settlements: Meheba (Northern Province), Mayukwayuka (Western Province) and Mantapala (Northern Province). Mantapala settlement was established in response to the influx of roughly 17,000 Congolese refugees in 2017, who fled tensions in HautKatanga in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).

The GRZ has adopted a whole-of-society approach to hosting refugees, which aims to enable their social and economic inclusion side-by-side with the host population. This progressive approach is firmly anchored in the country's Seventh National Development Plan 2017 – 2022 (7NDP) and the Agenda to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030. In response to the influx of refugees from DRC in 2017, the GRZ endorsed the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) to guide its settlement approach and introduce durable solutions from the onset of the crisis.

WFP and UNHCR have been supporting the refugee population in Mantapala through registration and

### JNA METHODOLOGY

Data collection for the assessment took place in September 2020. A total of 1,128 randomly selected refugee households were interviewed and Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews were conducted. Findings are statistically representative at settlement level.

Refugee Status Determination (RSD), protection services for persons with specific needs, provision of food assistance and livelihoods support since 2017.

In September 2020 WFP and UNHCR, with technical support from the Joint UNHCR-WFP Programme Excellence and Targeting Hub, conducted a Joint Need Assessment (JNA) in Mantapala settlement with the following objectives:

- Provide an update on the levels of vulnerability and livelihoods resilience among refugee households, factoring the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Develop socio-economic profiles for the most vulnerable households; and
- Inform programmatic decisions and determine whether the current status-based provision of food assistance could be targeted based on needs.

 **90** HIGHLY VULNERABLE  
PERCENT

 **21** ENGAGED IN EMERGENCY LIVELIHOOD COPING STRATEGIES  
PERCENT

 **77%** FOOD EXPENDITURE SHARE

 **18%** HAVE SPECIFIC NEEDS

 **43%** WITHOUT INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITY

 **73%** LACK OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS

 **22%** ACCESS TO LAND

## FINDINGS

### Vulnerability

Household vulnerability was measured by combining three indicators: economic vulnerability, food consumption and livelihoods resilience. **In Mantapala, 90 percent of refugee households remain highly vulnerable and entirely dependent on external assistance.** In other words, the large majority are unable to meet their basic food needs, tend to engage in negative coping mechanisms with potentially detrimental repercussions on lives and livelihoods, and have poor or borderline food consumption.

**The refugee population was found to be homogeneously poor, with a little over half of households owning some productive assets.** On average, 77 percent of household expenditures are on food, leaving few resources to cover non-food needs let alone to invest in livelihoods. The pandemic has further undermined refugees' low levels of resilience, with the large majority of households confronted with increasing debt levels.

**Despite sufficient food available in country, 44 percent of refugee households had poor or borderline food consumption in September 2020.** Half of households indicated not to have had enough food or money to buy food during the seven days preceding

the survey. Further, the average refugee household diet consumed does not ensure the recommended diet and nutritional diversity.

### **Over a fifth of households rely on emergency livelihood coping strategies to meet their food needs.**

The share of households forced to borrow money or food increased substantially during the course of 2020, when the pandemic undermined the purchasing power of many. Begging was the second most applied means of coping, a reflection of the dire situation and raising serious protection concerns.

### **The JNA identified three levels of household vulnerability - highly vulnerable (Priority Groups 1 and 2), moderately vulnerable (Priority 3) and least vulnerable (Priority 4).**

Vulnerability levels differ according to households' economic capacity to meet minimum food and non-food needs, reliance on negative coping strategies, and ability to consume an acceptable diet. High vulnerability further differentiates between households who struggle to meet their food and non-food needs even with the assistance they receive (Priority 1), and those who fare well with assistance but would not be able to meet their basic food needs if the assistance were to be withdrawn (Priority 2).

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILES OF THE MOST VULNERABLE HOUSEHOLDS (PRIORITY GROUP 1 & 2)

OVERALL VULNERABILITY	PROTECTION-RELATED VULNERABILITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Single-headed households</li><li>• Household heads without formal education</li><li>• No income source other than food assistance</li><li>• Small asset ownership</li><li>• No crop production</li><li>• No access to land for cultivation</li><li>• Residence in dilapidated shelter</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Households with disabled or chronically sick members</li><li>• Female-headed households</li><li>• Households taking care of unaccompanied children and/or separated children</li><li>• Households with elderly members, children and/or women at risk</li><li>• Households with specific legal and physical protection needs</li></ul>

The three levels of vulnerability translate into four Priority Groups that will help determine who to assist with different assistance packages. The JNA profiling exercise identified characteristics that refugee households with similar levels of vulnerabilities have in common. Below is a list of household characteristics associated with heightened vulnerability for Priority Groups 1 and 2.

### **Protection**

**While an increasing share of refugees indicated to feel safe in the settlement, a number of protection-related concerns were highlighted.** They include **people with specific needs** who have very little to no opportunities to engage in livelihoods and income generating activities to contribute to households' economic standing.

**Sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV)** remains a problem and is expected to increase during the pandemic.

**Extensive school closures** due to the pandemic further compromised the education of refugee children in 2020, resulting in low attendance rates, particularly at secondary school level, and potentially increasing exposure to **child protection risks**.

While refugees appreciate available complaint and feedback mechanisms, the **time it takes to receive feedback** tends to undermine their trust in such AAP initiatives. Also, **female refugee participation** in decision making processes and committees remains significantly below the official target.

### **Livelihoods**

**Refugee households have greatly limited opportunities to build and improve their livelihoods, let alone to become self-reliance.** The share of households not engaged in any productive activities has further increased since 2019 and affected 43 percent of households in September 2020. The increase is likely to

be the result of the pandemic containment measures, which have further limited refugees' movements and significantly curtailed economic activities.

The main livelihoods sources in Mantapala settlement – most of them informal and unsustainable – include casual labour, followed by small businesses, petty trading, skilled trade, charcoal selling and food production. While agriculture is the mainstay economic sector in the district, just 5 percent of households considered food/cash crop production and sales as their main income source. Only 22 percent indicated to have access to land, of which the large majority grow crops for their own consumption and 32 percent for the purpose of selling. Almost all households (90 percent) are greatly challenged in pursuing their livelihoods, particularly due to the lack of agricultural inputs, lack of capital and limited access to land.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The JNA highlights a range of programmatic implications and recommendations that provide a framework for the choice, design and implementation of the most appropriate and feasible response.

### **Food Assistance**

- Continued provision of full food assistance to the entire refugee population in Mantapala due to the high levels of vulnerability, as long as resources remain available.
- Adjustment of the food assistance cash transfer value to account for continuously rising inflation rates, ensuring adequate levels of assistance are provided to meet needs.
- Implementation of shock-responsive analyses and scenarios for future preparedness to support refugee households to meet their needs and protect livelihoods resilience when faced with climate-related, economic or other shocks.
- Increased integration of refugees in national social protection programmes to establish a nexus between humanitarian and development assistance.

### **Livelihoods and Self-Reliance**

- Expansion and strengthening of livelihoods interventions to promote self-reliance, with a focus on multi-year programming that leverages existing initiatives supported by GRZ and development partners.
- Prioritize livelihoods support for households with greater livelihoods resilience (Priority Groups 2-4) with provision of:
  - > agricultural inputs and initiatives to increase agricultural productivity
  - > value chain development, aggregation and strengthening of market linkages
  - > entrepreneurship development and access to finance skills development (trade) and vocational training opportunities for youth
- Continued advocacy with the GRZ to ensure refugees' freedom of movement and right to work
- Increased integration of refugees in national social protection programmes to establish a nexus between

humanitarian and development assistance

- Inclusion of host communities in diversified livelihood opportunities to mitigate potential tensions between refugees and local populations.

### **Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations**

- Expansion of protection services to support persons with specific needs, with a priority focus on strengthened prevention, identification and referrals of SGBV cases.
- Close coordination with the education sector to ensure child protection is safeguarded and monitoring of possible rises in child labour as a result of lockdowns and school closures.
- Improvement of complaints and feedback mechanisms to ensure closure of the communication loop.
- Expansion of beneficiary participation in community-based committees, ensuring sufficient participation of female representatives.

**MAY 2021**

## **RECOMMENDED TARGETING AND PRIORITIZATION APPROACH FOR FOOD AND LIVELIHOODS ASSISTANCE**

**Due to high levels of vulnerability in the settlement, targeting food assistance based on need is not appropriate at this time. Thus, monthly food assistance to all refugees is recommended to be continued.** In case of future operational resource constraints assistance is recommended to be prioritized based on household vulnerability and needs:

- **The most vulnerable** should be prioritized and be granted a full food assistance package;
- **The less vulnerable** should receive a partial assistance package complemented with the opportunity to be targeted for livelihood support in order to support them in the process of graduating from food assistance.

Vulnerability profiles and eligibility criteria are highly recommended to be verified through community consultations to help identify who to assist, with what type of assistance package.

**For further information please contact: [WFP.UNHCR.hub@wfp.org](mailto:WFP.UNHCR.hub@wfp.org)**

**Cinzia Papavero**, Senior Targeting Advisor

**Yingci Sun**, Hub Assessment Officer

**Emmanuel Kilio**, M&E officer, WFP Zambia | [emmanuel.kilio@wfp.org](mailto:emmanuel.kilio@wfp.org)

**Ancillah Nyanjige Manning**, Senior program OFFICER, UNHCR Zambia | [manninga@unhcr.org](mailto:manninga@unhcr.org)