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INTRODUCTION

The current refugee and migrant flows from Venezuelans have generated the largest displacement of its kind in recent Latin American history. More than 5.4 million Venezuelans have left their country since 2014, according to the United Nations, and many others have left whose cases have not been registered by authorities. Many of them fled their country for multiple reasons – severe shortage of food, medicine and vital services, hyperinflation, violent crime, and violations of human rights, including arbitrary arrests, persecutions by military courts, torture, abuses by security forces/intelligence services and while detained. Many of them reported they had suffered human rights violations on the route.

The Republic of Peru is the second country of arrival of refugees and migrants from Venezuela and is the country with the highest number of asylum applications from Venezuelan citizens. In Peru, as of August 2020, it was estimated that 1,043,460 Venezuelans were staying in the country, of whom 496,095 would be seeking refugee status. The current picture shows a preponderance of young population with a significant presence of boys, girls and adolescents distributed in small households.

Encuentros, Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes (hereinafter Encuentros SJM) has been involved in the response to the Venezuelan crisis in Peru since the end of 2017, while the Danish Refugee Council (hereinafter DRC) has started its co-implementation from July 2020. Encuentros SJM and DRC has jointly started protection analysis, assessment of the needs of the Venezuelan population, mapping of relevant actors, identification of migration trends and patterns, protection initiatives, and humanitarian advocacy. Encuentros SJM and DRC collaborate with a response and presence in Arequipa and several areas of Lima, conducting protection monitoring, information dissemination on documentation, regularization and access to services and rights, providing legal assistance, ensuring in-kind, cash and voucher-based individualised protection assistance and/or referring people in need to specialised/non-specialised service providers.

This report provides an overview of the protection needs of and risks faced by the Venezuelans in Lima – where the highest percentage of refugee and migrant population from Venezuela is concentrated – the conditions they face, their prospects of obtaining legal status, and migration’s projections. The data utilised for this report have been collected by protection officers during the first two cycles of protection monitoring.

Protection monitoring involves collecting, verifying, and analysing information in order to identify human rights violations and protection risks encountered by the refugee and migrant population. The main goal is to guide programming, identify individuals and households in need, and reinforce the obligations of duty bearers to prevent human rights violations, protect and fulfil the rights of affected individuals.

To visualise main results of protection monitoring, please consult our Dashboard to this link.

For more information, please contact:

Anna Maria Montironi
Protection Coordinator
Danish Refugee Council
anna.montironi@drc.ngo

Sandra Chinchay
Community Outreach Specialist
Encuentros Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes
schinchay@encuentros-sjs.org
1. METHODOLOGY

Between January and February 2021, the Encuentros SJM and DRC Protection Monitoring team in Peru randomly selected 290 displaced households from Venezuela, corresponding to a total population of 996 individuals, living in the districts of San Juan de Lurigancho and San Juan de Miraflores in Metropolitan Lima. Direct observations were conducted in four areas of the selected districts in key areas (markets, schools, health facilities, religious centers, etc.) to complement findings proceeding from household surveys.

The household survey consists of 95 questions that collected data at the household and individual level. Questions included those on demographics, legal documentation, safety and security, migration projections/intentions to stay, shelter, health, livelihoods, WASH, expenditures, food consumption, information about services and assistance, as well as questions specifically relating to women, children and people with disabilities. The survey is administered with the head of the household – and any other member of the nuclear family for the relevant sections. Direct observation checklist observes 37 dimensions across 13 sectors: people with special needs, environment, protection, housing, water sanitation and hygiene, health, education, isolation, integration and social cohesion, sex age and diversity, mental health, child protection and livelihoods.

1. In this report, the term "displaced" is used to refer to migrants and asylum seekers who find themselves in a context of mobility as part of a migration flow that is considered forced.
2. KEY FINDINGS

• Between 1st January and 28th February 2021, the Protection Monitoring team of DRC and Encuentros SJM in Peru conducted 290 interviews with displaced households from Venezuela, representing a total population of 996 people. Overall, since the start of the protection monitoring in October, the team has interviewed 429 families composed by 1,384 persons. The profile of the displaced population in the area of Lima Metropolitana is predominantly young, with 41.6% underage and 56.5% with ages comprised between 18 and 59 years old. In terms of sex disaggregation, women represent a slight majority of the population. 95% of the 104 Peruvian nationals are under-18, most of them less than 5 years old.

• 26% of the surveyed population declared to suffer from some kind of disability, which implies that 60% of the families cope with a dependable member in higher or lower degree. While visual and physical disabilities are associated to people with ‘Specific needs’, most of them suffer from other pathologies. 4 cases of torture survivors were identified for the first time in this round of monitoring, belonging to two different families and including one children of 6 to 11 years old among them.

• The displaced population living in Lima Metropolitana belongs in its majority to the first waves of flights from Venezuela back in 2018, as the length of displacement is 28 months in average. However, families that entered irregularly in the country and live in this area were more likely to have arrived one year and a half ago. The condition upon entrance in the country did have an impact on the treatment received. Despite irregular entrances are very limited over the total population surveyed, almost half of them (47.8%) suffered robberies, extorsion and violence perpetrated by authorities at the border and by (armed) informal groups (compiling here both the ‘Transnational Groups’ and the’ Irregular armed groups’).

• Over the total of the self-reported residence permits, 54.2% of the population did not have a status that allowed them access to stable livelihoods; and only 42.5% hold identity documents that entitle access to health and education services. The modality of entrance was equally determining in terms of documents and residence permits, with significantly higher rates of total lack of permits for those that entered irregularly and higher tendency to resort to asylum application mechanisms.

• Looking at the future of their displacement, surveyed population over the two cycles of monitoring has shown a clear willingness to settle in Peru. The link between the situation in the country of origin and the intentionality of turning displacement into a permanent state is highlighted with the low rate of ‘Return upon the condition of an improved situation’ (only 7.9% and 27.2% at short and long term, respectively).
• More than 60% of the population did not apply for the refugee status yet, and 82.6% of them (which means 147 of the 290 families, 50.7% of the total) does not consider it an option. Though main reason to explain this proportion is ‘Lack of interest’, the 56.2% of the population that do not intend to present the application might have been taking this decision based in misinformation and lack of support by the pertinent authorities.

• The significative amount of children out-of-school is directly associated to the exclusion from school of three quarters of the children between 0 to 5 years old. 88% of the parents of children 0 to 5 years old-out-of-school did not specify an explanation for this situation, while the ‘Lack of places’ is the main obstacle for the children of 6 to 11 years old and older. It was relevant to highlight that no children with ages between 0 to 5 years old of families that entered irregularly in the country attended school. In general terms, those families not sending their children to school reported in higher rate ‘Bullying’, ‘Physical Violence’, ‘Undernutrition’, but above all, more fear of ‘Discrimination’ and ‘Trafficking’. On the opposite side, they showed less fear of ‘Drug addiction’ and ‘Exploitation’. The responses also showed a slightly lower concern about risks for boys in comparison to the perceived risks for girls.

• The family circle, that compresses as perpetrators both the intimate partner and family members of the victim, stands as the main context of violence exercised against women and girls in 52.1% of the cases. Nevertheless, the population interviewed in this round of the protection monitoring was more vocal to highlight violence occurring in the context of the ‘Community’ (25.5%), understood as external persons they interact with in their environment. The correlation between context of exerted violence and knowledge of support mechanisms hints that the population has a high degree of tolerance towards “private/intimate violence” and there might not be safe spaces for the victim to even explore the dimension of the abuse. For half of the 48.3% that established the peak of violence after arriving to Peru frequency increased to at least one episode a week and ‘Physical violence’ was the dominant form of abuse.

• The average housing profile of the displaced families corresponds to ‘rented rooms’ in residential buildings. A clearer market price trend stands since the monitoring started in October, with three quarters of the rents living in ‘Rooms’ for a maximum of 600 PEN. The data shows two scenarios: first, that most of the families are living in shared spaces even if they report to rent a ‘Room’ for the family, with the protection risks this implies; second, that in order to access more comfortable property alternatives, families have to resort to associations with other individuals/families. These conclusions are reaffirmed with the high rate of respondents that confirmed they use a shared bathroom in their housing (52.4%). 81.8% of the respondents expend at least half of their income in paying the rent.
• 89.6% of those that reported they needed to access the service (72.8% of the total population) had their needs covered. The main reasons that demanded medical attention for the population were linked to ‘Primary Healthcare attention’ (46.6%) and ‘Emergency’ (38.6%), but the data hints that families resorted to primary healthcare centres in higher degree than to Emergency rooms to respond to unexpected diseases or medical conditions. The prolonged period of displacement, living conditions and stress generated by one year of pandemic emergency are taking a toll on the mental health of the displaced population. ‘Strong’ anxiety and demotivation episodes occur at a weekly frequency in more than 80% of the cases.

• The population surveyed in this round of protection monitoring face important rates of unemployment and informality. Only 44.1% of the head of households confirmed to have a stable job. The analysis shows a higher proportion of wage-earning single-heads of HHs in comparison to the head of nuclear families. Single-headed HH are more likely to have 8 to 10 daily working hours at the expense of smaller wages. There is a clear correlation between higher salaries (more than 100PEN a week) and number of worked hours, as 62.9% of the population had to work a minimum of 8 hours a day to earn as much as possible. 70% of the population resorts to irregular jobs, as ‘Street selling’ and ‘daily occasional work’. ‘Dependable work’ provides a salary to less than one quarter of the population, but 88.4% of them earn more than 100PEN a week. The main barrier to access livelihoods opportunities continue to be the lack of adequate ‘Documentation’.

• The estimated picture of the economy of the displaced families shows a clear negative balance that aggravates as the size of the family increases. This is confirmed by the discrepancy between the average 336PEN/month of income a family gets and the estimated 340PEN/month a HH of three members expends to cover its food and shelter needs. Housing takes the biggest share of families’ economy at the expense of decreasing diet provision. The nutrition profile of the populations shows compromised rates. Just half of the population affirms to eat at least three meals a day, but still one third of them consume a maximum of two proteins per week.

• Despite the majority of the population does not complain about the quality of the water (89%), they report additional barriers as ‘Cost’, ‘Lack of water’, ‘dirty water’, distance’ and ‘other’. Overall, it was 28.3% of the interviewed families the ones that reported access barriers, with no significative statistical differences across districts. Considering that 63.8% had a neutral evaluation of the environment, it results that the general self-perception of the space of residence does not suppose a major concern for the population.
3. DEMOGRAPHICS

The Protection team of DRC and Encuentros SJM in Peru conducted 290 interviews between the 1st of January and the 28th of February 2021, reaching a total of 996 people. Overall, since the start of the protection monitoring in October, the team has interviewed 429 families composed by 1,384 persons. With more than twice of people interviewed in the beginning of the year in comparison to the previous round, the demographic trends hinted in the first report kept constant in a good degree. The profile of the displaced population in the area of Lima Metropolitana is predominantly young, with 41.6% underage and 56.5% with ages comprised between 18 and 59 years old. In terms of sex disaggregation, women represent a slight majority of the population. Despite the majority of the population holds a Venezuelan nationality, 1 out 10 persons does not fall under this category. Indeed, 95% of the 104 Peruvian nationals are under-18, most of them less than 5 years old. An age pattern that repeats for stateless and those with double or other nationalities. This scene poses a significant degree of uncertainty over the administrative situation of mixed families (Venezuelan parents with Peruvian children born in the country) and the access to services and jobs, thus exacerbating the challenges for their systemic and economic integration.

The size of households keeps stable at an average of 3 members, coherent with the fact that almost 60% of the population lives in families of 3 persons or less. However, this variable is highly determined by the civil situation of the head of household, in a manner that couples tend to live in larger families (average of 4 members) in comparison to single-headed households. In the case of the latter, 92% of these families are headed by women. Nevertheless, there should be special attention for the 17.58% of HHs composed by 5 or more members given the additional burden they might face in relation to cost of living and basic needs.
Dual-headed households VS Single-headed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual-headed households</th>
<th>Single-headed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. PROTECTION

The displaced population living in Lima Metropolitana belongs in its majority to the first waves of flights from Venezuela back in 2018, as the length of displacement is 28 months in average for this round of monitoring. The data shows a significant variation of this variable between the families that entered regularly and irregularly, becoming remarkably shorter for the latter with 16 months in average. It should be further explored either if border control policies have changed or if displacement routes have changed and Lima does not constitute a preferred final destination at the moment and why.

Thanks to the two rounds of monitoring, the consolidated data shows that practically all the population transited at least through another country before arriving to Peru, concretely Colombia and Ecuador. The transit time was also brief, with 66.4% of the overall population interviewed since October having arrived in a maximum of 7 days and with no significant differences between regular and irregular entrances.

On the contrary, the condition upon entrance in the country did have an impact on the treatment received. Despite irregular entrances are very limited over the total population surveyed, almost half of them (47.8%) suffered robberies, extortion and violence perpetrated by authorities at the border and by (armed) informal groups (compiling here both the ‘Transnational Groups’ and the ‘Irregular armed groups’). Besides, there is a significant correlation of the rates of robberies with the action of ‘Transnational groups’, which could hint the existence of abusive trafficking practices in the region. On the other hand, just 14.6% of families entering
through regular channels lived an episode of abuse, mostly perpetrated by the same displaced population and authorities of other countries.

The modality of entrance was equally determining in terms of documents and residence permits, with significantly higher rates of total lack of permits for those that entered irregularly and higher tendency to resort to asylum application mechanisms (thirty and eight points above the average, respectively). This shows that irregular entrance perpetuates a situation of administrative exclusion from the system that has a direct impact over the exercise of rights. Over the total of the self-reported residence permits, 54.2% of the population did not have a status that allowed them access to stable livelihoods; and only 42.5% hold identity documents that entitle access to health and education services.

As the population interviewed in this round of monitoring fled from Venezuela in the same periods, triggers of displacement follow a similar pattern. 71.1% left the country because of the incapacity to cover minimum standards of living. Family reunification consolidates as the fourth most repeated reason across the two monitoring exercises and confirms that the majority of arrivals in Lima correspond to the first wave of displacement in the region. Only in this round of monitoring, ‘Fear of persecution’ becomes more relevant in the classification in correlation with the four identified cases of torture survivors.

Looking at the future of their displacement, surveyed population over the two cycles of monitoring has shown a clear willingness to settle in Peru at a short term (less than 3 years from the date of interview) and, especially for the population interviewed between January and February, at a longer term (3 years and onwards). The deepening economic crisis in Venezuela, that faces an unprecedent inflation rate increase in the first months of 2021 during the period when these interviews took place, needs to be considered when analysing this data. The link between the situation in the country of origin and the intentionality of turning displacement into a permanent state is highlighted with the low rate of ‘Return upon the condition of an improved situation’ (only 7.9% and 27.2% at short and long term, respectively).

In this environment that anticipates a long-term displacement of Venezuelans in the region, the population desists from requesting the refugee status to define their situation. Following similar patterns depicted in the previous protection monitoring report, there is very limited interest in the figure of asylum and it is not associated to granting their stay in the country and access to services. More than 60% of the population did not apply for the refugee status yet, and 82.6% of them (which means 147 of the 290 families, 50.7% of the total) does not consider it an option. Though main reason to explain this proportion is ‘Lack of interest’, the 56.2% of
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Intention to stay in the SHORT term

- Staying: 85.5%
- Return to Venezuela if the conditions improve: 7.9%
- Do not know: 4.1%
- Transit to another country: 1.4%
- Return to Venezuela even if the conditions do not improve: 0.7%
- Move to safer place within Peru: 0.3%

Intention to stay in the LONG term

- Staying: 58.3%
- Return to Venezuela if the conditions improve: 27.2%
- Do not know: 11.4%
- Transit to another country: 2.1%
- Return to Venezuela if the conditions do not improve: 1%

Reasons to not having intention to apply for the refugee status

- No interest: 40.6%
- PTP owner: 33.8%
- I do not know what it is: 10.8%
- Other I do not know how to apply: 6.1%
- I do not know how to apply: 4.1%
- Fear of barrier to work: 0.7%
- Fear of barrier to work: 0.7%

On the other hand, the population that do not intend to present the application might have been taking this decision based in misinformation and lack of support by the pertinent authorities. However, it becomes relevant to highlight that for the first time some of the interviewees expressed ‘Fear to authorities’ as reason to not having applied for the refugee status yet, but this was not associated to the ‘torture survivor’ detected cases.

On the other hand, the 38.6% that applied for the refugee status face 21 months in average to see their petition resolved. Considering that in average the population has spent 27 months in Peru since their arrival, it shows a limited institutional capacity to resolve active profiles and further information needs to be gathered to shed some light over the perception that the population has about the refugee figure and how delays and lack of resources might be negatively affecting the rights of the displaced.
5. CHILD PROTECTION AND EDUCATION

Venezuelan displaced population is the big presence of youth, where the under-18 represents 41.6% of the persons. More interestingly, half of them are below the age of 5 years, many of them with Peruvian nationality. Despite the high birth rate, the civil registration raises to almost a total level, except for a family that reports not being aware about the procedure to follow.

School enrolment gives a slightly positive balance, with 52.9% of the children attending classes. However, the significative amount of children out-of-school is directly associated to the exclusion from school of three quarters of the children between 0 to 5 years old. After two full rounds of protection monitoring, these figures represent a consolidated trend among the population living in Lima Metropolitana. As it was highlighted in the previous report, this separation does not correspond to variations in terms of area of residence or sex, but seems to constitute a decision that the families do not categorise within the given options of the questionnaire. Indeed, 88% of the parents of children 0 to 5 years old out-of-school did not specify an explanation for this situation, while the ‘Lack of places’ is the main obstacle for the children of 6 to 11 years old and older. It was relevant to highlight that no children with ages between 0 to 5 years old of families that entered irregularly in the country attended school.

Considering that 74.9% of the families explained the absence from school of their children with the option ‘Other Reason’, DRC and Encuentros SJM is gathering more detailed information through qualitative tools to better understand the reasoning of these figures and real obstacles for the families. The direct observation by the protection team did not evince a high rate of child labour, having detected in this round of monitoring four children (three girls and one boy) with ages between 0 to 11 years old, which no-enrolment in school was justified by ‘Other reasons’ and ‘Lack of places’. Additionally, six of the ‘Children at risk’ also had a ‘Severe medical condition’.

In a different line, when asked about the external risk factors children are exposed to in the context, the respondents provided a more specific scenario. In general terms, those families not sending their children to school reported in higher rate ‘Bullying’, ‘Physical Violence’, ‘Undernutrition’, but above all, more fear of ‘Discrimination’ and ‘Trafficking’. On the opposite side, they showed less fear of ‘Drug addiction’ and ‘Exploitation’. The responses also showed a slightly lower concern about risks for boys in comparison to the perceived risks for girls, with 10.5% and 7.4% respectively for no specific risks affecting children. In all the cases, ‘Sexual violence’ becomes a constant risk for the underage population (15.1%), followed by ‘Bullying’ (14.5%), ‘Physical Violence’ (13.4%) and ‘Discrimination’ (11.8%) as main menaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children enrolled in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 0 to 5 yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Listed options in the questionnaire are: cost, transport, unaware about the registration process, Venezuelan titles not recognized, not enough places, child labour, cognitive impediment, bullying, violence/abuse perpetrated by teachers, school shifts, lack of documentation, discrimination, it is not a priority, other reason, prefers not to reply.
Perceived Protection Risks for Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children exploited as a labour force</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No risks perceived</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug addiction</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human trafficking</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual exploitation</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon/Neglect</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know about potential risks</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. GENDER BASED-VIOLENCE

The second round of protection monitoring has reaffirmed the indicators of widespread gender-based violence perpetrated against women and girls. The family circle, that compresses as perpetrators both the intimate partner and family members of the victim, stands as the main context of violence exercised against women and girls in 52.1% of the cases. Nevertheless, the population interviewed in this round of the protection monitoring was more vocal to highlight violence occurring in the context of the ‘Community’ (25.5%), understood as external persons they interact with in their environment. This information is especially sensitive as it is related to higher rates of ‘Daily’ and ‘Weekly’ episodes and involves all three forms of violence (psychological, physical and sexual) in constant proportions with the average results. The population also disclosed for the first time that violence ‘During the displacement’ and by ‘National authorities’ are present but does not seem to constitute a regular pattern of abuse (both cases referred by 2.8% and 2.1% respectively).

The general knowledge about the kind of support mechanisms available for the victim fluctuates depending on the context where it was exerted, in a manner that ‘Support by family members’ is proportionally more referred when the interviewee is referring to violence occurred outside of the family circle, meaning either in the ‘Community’, ‘During the transit’ and by
'National authorities'. This correlation hints that the population has a high degree of tolerance towards “private/intimate violence” and there might not be safe spaces for the victim to even explore the dimension of the abuse. Nevertheless, there seems to be either a general lack of awareness about the available services or mistrust on the response system, with 65.2% of the respondents ignoring what possible alternatives there could be.

As it occurred with the analysis of the first round of protection monitoring, there is a constant relevant share of the population that does not enter into specifications in this section of the questionnaire, with a round off 16% of the respondents reporting to be unaware about the context and frequency of GBV. The proportion raises to 38.3% when talking about the stage of displacement where violence is more frequent, second most mentioned period just below ‘After months in Peru’. However, the persistent lack of awareness about the violent environment becomes inconsistent when comparing it to the responses about the classification of violence. In fact, across the two exercises of monitoring 'Psychological', 'Physical' and ‘Sexual’ are homogeneously reported in third shares even for those that responded ‘I do not know’ to the other questions. Based just on the interpretation of the quantitative results and waiting to finalise the analysis of complementary assessment tools to interpret the narrative behind the numbers, it becomes obvious that GBV rates rise to alarming levels if it is considered that population itself is underreporting the caseload.

Looking at the specific data of those that reported violence was more likely to occur before settling in Peru (just 13.5% of the population that reported either in 'Venezuela' or 'during displacement'), it was more associated to Psychological type (41.3% of this group) and shown lower frequency rates overall. The perpetrators were also usually external to the family circle and there was a positive swift in the perception and awareness about support services. On the other hand, for half of the 48.3% that established the peak of violence after arriving to Peru (categories 'After months in Peru' and 'at arrival') frequency increased to at least one episode a week and 'Physical violence' was the dominant form of abuse. Hence, the intimate partner and the family context are the most likely spaces of violence for population displaced in Peru. In reference exclusively to ‘Sexual violence’, 51.2% of the population referred it happens at least once per week.
7. SHELTER

The average housing profile of the displaced families corresponds to ‘rented rooms’ in residential buildings. Indeed, 77.6% of the interviewed HHs respond to these characteristics and just 21.4% of respondents lived in ‘rented houses’. Two isolated cases located in Miraflores district reported to live in alternative housing options, that do not fall under the standard categories of the sector. Most extended material of construction is concrete (95.2%), but ‘Timber’, ‘Plastic’ and ‘Other materials’ are also used irrespectively of the kind of housing reported. The joint analysis of both protection monitoring rounds confirm that material of construction and kind of housing do not significantly affect the price of the rent.

In this sense, the average rent price stabilises in the tranche between 300 to 600PEN (61%), followed by 0 to 300 PEN (26.2%). A clearer market price trend stands since the monitoring started in October, with three quarters of the rents living in ‘Rooms’ for a maximum of 600PEN. On the other side, higher volatility is identified in the ‘House’ market, as these rents can be found from 0 to 300PEN up to more than 1,000PEN.

Nevertheless, the overcrowding situation that displaced families face results from the complex intersection of the kind of housing, the price of rent and the number of strangers they share their space with. Applying this triple lens to the gathered data, it becomes clear that stable rent prices are far from guaranteeing security and integrity to the families and reaffirm the prevalence of an abusive market. Indeed, even half of the families that paid 600PEN or more (12.7% of the overall population) for a ‘House’ shared the space at least with another person. Moreover, 26.9% of the families whose rent was below the 600PEN and that predominantly lived in ‘Rooms’ were found in the same situation. This data shows two scenarios: first, that most of the families are living in shared spaces even if they report to rent a ‘Room’ for the family, with the protection risks this implies; secondly, that in order to access more comfortable property alternatives, families have to resort to associations with other individuals/families. These conclusions are reaffirmed with the high rate of respondents that confirmed they use a shared bathroom in their housing (52.4%).

How many non-family members do you share your accommodation with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusive</th>
<th>With 1 or 2</th>
<th>With 3 or 5</th>
<th>With 6 or 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No shared</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs for shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of PEN</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1000 PEN</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-1000 PEN</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-300 PEB</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-600 PEN</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. As per DRC-Encuentro’s questionnaire: Temporary collective shelter, Room, House, Informal Settlement, Homeless.
Despite the fact that accessible shelter options do not fully guarantee the safety of the families, the cost of the rent represents a high burden over the economy of the families. In absolute terms, 81.8% of the respondents expend at least half of their income in paying rent, and the proportion decreases to 46.6% (135 families) if we just count those that deplete ‘more than the half’ and ‘almost everything’. These figures raise alarming concerns as we crosscheck the costs of the rents of the families and discover that 83.7% of the families that dedicate almost all their resources to the payment have rents below 600 PEN.

The risk of eviction, either present or past, is still high, with 42.1% of the families finding themselves exposed to an event of dislodgment. The data gathered in this round of the protection monitoring shows a significative territorial differentiation, as the risk of eviction drops below the 40% for those living in San Juan de Miraflores in comparison to the 45% of those living in Lurigancho. Confronting this data with the information gathered about self-perception of integration and relation with host community, those that reported being at risk of eviction were associated to slightly more negative perceptions over integration, relation with host community and perception of security. These trends confirm the need to reinforce social cohesion and ease sources of conflict between communities through the institutional and humanitarian response.

8. HEALTH

The healthcare centres are usually a point of reference for the communities, especially since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic last year. Consequently, and in correlation with the good rates of self-perceived integration, 91.4% of the displaced population is aware about the location of the existing centres in their community. The analysis of the data showed that neither the district of residence nor the length of stay in Peru were determining factors for the lack of knowledge about the existence of healthcare facilities. It was not linked either to the absence of need for medical attention. Hence, misinformation is still an obstacle to consider in the response.

Siguiendo con una respuesta positiva del sistema de salud en Perú, el 89,6% de los que informaron necesitar acceder al servicio (72,8 % de la población total) tenía sus necesidades cubiertas. Las barreras informadas por el resto de la población fueron, en el siguiente orden, 'por la pandemia', 'documentación', 'falta de servicios especializados', 'otras razones', 'costo del servicio' y 'discriminación'. En consecuencia, la emergencia sanitaria que afecta al sistema tiene un efecto...
Continuing with the positive response by the healthcare system in Peru, 89.6% of those that reported they needed to access the service (72.8% of the total population) had their needs covered. The barriers reported by the remaining population were, in the following order, ‘Consequence of the Pandemic’, ‘Documentation’, ‘Lack of Specialised Services’, ‘Other reasons’, ‘Cost of the service’ and ‘Discrimination’. In consequence, the health emergency affecting the system has an exclusive effect more relevant at this stage than the administrative barriers or absence of specialised services.

The main reasons that demanded medical attention for the population were linked to ‘Primary Healthcare attention’ (46.6%) and ‘Emergency’ (38.6%), but the data hints that families resorted to primary healthcare centres in higher degree than to Emergency rooms to respond to unexpected diseases or medical conditions. Indeed, 71.9% of the primary attention cases did not have ‘Specific Health needs’ in the HH, in comparison to the 55.6% of Emergency cases that reported the same. It needs to be considered that more than half of the patients that had to pay for the medical attention referred to ‘Emergency services’, as the lack of an adequate Insurance coverage determines that the provision of this assistance needs to be reimbursed by the person. The situation of administrative irregularity and lack of formal registered jobs by the majority of the displaced population determines that a significative proportion of persons do not qualify to access the free healthcare attention.

On the opposite side, the incidence of chronic conditions such as those requiring ‘Specialised services’, ‘Hypertension’, ‘Diabetes’, ‘Cancer’ and ‘Kidney Failure’ affect to more than one quarter of the population (26.2%) was mainly channelled through the Emergency care, which may imply these cases remain unmonitored until severe episodes occur.

The prolonged period of displacement, living conditions and stress generated by one year of pandemic emergency are taking a toll on the mental health of the displaced population. The data shows a strong correlation between anxiety and demotivation levels, with almost identical rates of severities for each indicator that determine that two thirds of the population show significative rates of stress. Moreover, ‘Strong’ anxiety and demotivation episodes occur at a weekly frequency in more than 80% of the cases.
9. LIVELIHOODS, FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION

The precarious conditions of the labour market in Peru have got more complicated as a consequence of the spillover effects of the COVID-19 crisis, that has reanimated the structural flaws of the countries around the world. In this context, the population surveyed in this round of protection monitoring face important rates of unemployment and informality. Just 44.1% of the heads of households confirmed to have a stable job and this proportion decreased to 38.3% in San Juan de Lurigancho. The analysis shows a higher proportion of wage-earning single-heads of HHs in comparison to the head of nuclear families, and slightly higher rates of employment of female head of HH (25.2%) than men (18.8%).

Indeed, the main differences across groups of populations in relation to livelihoods opportunities and access to income are referred to the civil status of the head of HH and the condition upon entrance in the country. Looking more in detail at the first dichotomy, the data shows significant variations in terms of number of worked hours and amount of weekly income, in a way that single-headed HH are more likely to have 8 to 10 daily working hours at the expense of smaller wages. In total, 41.9% of these families earn 100PEN a week or less, in comparison to the 32.3% of the nuclear families with a working head of household. However, there is a clear correlation between higher salaries (more than 100PEN a week) and number of worked hours, as 62.9% of the population had to work a minimum of 8 hours a day to earn as much as possible. Following the disaggregated analysis, as it was highlighted in the 'Protection' section above, the administrative irregularity of the entrance has a domino effect over the quality of life for the population. In this sense, only 36.1% of the heads of HH that entered irregularly in the country have a job, that in 69.6% of the occasions was irregular. In consequence, ‘Documentation’ constitutes the main barrier for 38.78% of this population (ten points above those that entered through regular channels).
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Crisis coping mechanisms, such as ‘depletion of savings’, ‘family loans’, ‘dependency on remittances’ and ‘other sources of income’, are extremely rare (5.8% of the population). In practical terms, 70% of the population resorts to irregular jobs, as ‘Street selling’ and ‘daily occasional work’. With the former receiving reduced income and less working hours in comparison to the latter. On the contrary, ‘Dependable work’ provides a salary to less than one quarter of the population, but 88.4% of them earn more than 100PEN a week.

The main barrier to access livelihoods opportunities continue to be the lack of adequate ‘Documentation’. The data hints a correlation between this barrier and the kind of job practised, where those involved in informal practices are more likely to refer this obstacle in contraposition to the 23.8% with ‘dependent job’. ‘The care of the children’ was most referred by the ones involved in ‘street selling’ and remains coherent with shorter working-hours done a day. These workers also seem to be more exposed to ‘Xenophobia’ and ‘Discrimination’. Finally, this round of protection monitoring shows an increase in the rate of ‘lack of work opportunities’, which connects with the challenging economic context in Peru.

A more detailed analysis of the income and expenditure patterns of the families shows a slight increase of expenditure dedicated to food and lower assigned to the shelter. While the average weekly income remained the same between the two monitoring exercises, single-headed HHs earned three soles less than nuclear families, which derived in general lower expenditures. As per the data gathered by DRC and Encuentros SJM team, an estimated picture of the economy of the displaced families shows a clear negative balance that aggravates as the size of the family increases. This is confirmed by
the discrepancy between the average 336PEN/month of income a family gets and the estimated 624PEN/month a HH of three members expends to cover its food and shelter needs. In all the cases, those figures fall far below the estimated poverty rates considered by Peruvian authorities. In total terms, it becomes a trend that housing takes the biggest share of families’ economy at the expense of decreasing diet provision. But this correlation also happens all the way round, which means that higher expenditures on food are associated to lower expenditures in rent.

Taking into consideration these consumption patterns, the nutrition profile of the populations shows compromised rates. Just half of the population affirms to eat at least three meals a day, but still one third of them consume a maximum of two proteins per week. 24.6% of families surviving with one or two meals a day reported expending at least ‘More than the half’ of their income. Just 45 families of the total interviewed expressed having some kind of nutrition specific need, of which 57.7% are related to some form of undernutrition and 33.3% to special recovery diets due to illness. There were not significant changes in terms of food and nutrients intake associated to these families, which hints that dietary options are strongly affected by the economy of the family.

7. As per the latest national statistical studies, the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) raises to an estimation of 286,73 PEN per capita per month as of estimations by January 2020. The MEB is composed by a set of 8 staples. Hence, a family of three members would expend 860,19PEN per month to satisfy minimum dietary and nutrition standards. The Consultive Poverty Commission of the INEI estimated in December 2020 the poverty line in Peru is fixed at 352PEN per capita/per month. Consequently, a family of three members would need to have access to 1,056PEN per month in order to cover all their needs in terms of food, housing, clothing, transportation, and fuel (not exhaustive list). Extreme poverty line falls to 561PEN/month and economic vulnerability would only be beaten above the 1,752PEN/month of expenditures.
The contribution to remittances is significantly high, with 46.2% of population sending ‘Weekly’ or ‘Monthly’ payments to relatives in Venezuela. Just 26.2% reports not making any contributions, which is strongly connected to the unemployment of the head of the HH. A slight increase in comparison to the previous round of monitoring. Though the questionnaire does not enter into the evaluation of the amount sent, it is possible to determine that ‘Monthly’ or longer frequencies are associated to families earning less than 50PEN a week; while the families earning more than 100PEN are more likely to send ‘weekly’ remittances.

### How often remittances are sent to Venezuela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each 6 months</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequently</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. WATER, SANITATION, HYGIENE AND ENERGY

Consistent with the housing profile of the displaced population and the infrastructure development of the Lima Metropolitana area, the majority of the population has access to the public water supply system in their room. Just two families living in the district of San Juan de Lurigancho had to resort to an open well to cover their needs. Although the house profile of these cases does not seem out of the overall parameters in comparison with the rest of the population, the lack of this basic service hints they live in substandard constructions that needs to be further explored.

In terms of the quality of the water, just 11% does not consider it drinkable and all of them are reporting the ‘Discontinuity of the service’ as main barrier. Despite the majority of the population does not complain about the quality of the water (89%), they report additional barriers as ‘Cost’, ‘Lack of water’, ‘dirty water’, distance’ and ‘other’. Overall, it was 28.3% of the interviewed families the ones that reported access barriers, with no significative statistical differences across districts.

In reference to the sanitation conditions in their environment, just 28% of the families reported a positive evaluation of the conditions around them. Considering that 63.8% had a neutral evaluation of the environment, it results that the general self-perception of the space of residence does not suppose a major concern for the population. However, as it was highlighted in the October-December report, even the population that complains about the quality of the water dissociates the hazardous effects it might create for the sanitation conditions of the environment, especially in the middle of a
pandemic crisis and when more than half of the population shares the bathroom with strangers in their housing.

Energy supply does not stand as a major concern for 90.7% of the population. However, across the two protection monitoring exercises there is a constant 10% of population left with almost no access to energy.

### 11. INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION

The average long length of displacement favours a good degree of social integration, with every 4 out of 5 families considering themselves part of the community they live in. The positive trend reaffirmed in the two monitoring exercises, is correlated to a general positive evaluation of the relation with the host community. Indeed, 55.6% of the total population has a ‘Good’ or ‘very good’ relationship with the neighbours, and 97.3% did not report a negative interaction. The expressed cases of xenophobia or discrimination are very limited and seem not to alter the general harmony of the community.

In relation to self-perceived security, 72.7% of the population consider they live in a secure area, with a slight perception of more perceived insecurity by the residents of San Juan de Miraflores. The analysis of the data shows that the perception of security and relation with the community are not correlated. Despite both variables have general positive rates, those reporting to feel ‘Somehow insecure’, ‘Insecure’ and ‘Very insecure’ gave answers on the positive side of the scale for the relation variable. On the other hand, these cases were more likely to report not feeling fully part of the community they live in.

#### Barriers to access water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to access water</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity of service</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of water</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of water</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe water</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a deeper analysis of the causes of insecurity in the area of residence, and comparing the results of the two rounds of monitoring, ‘Delinquency’, ‘Armed groups’, ‘Drugs trafficking’ and ‘Gangs’ are the four top factors that displaced and host population coexist with in both territories. However, San Juan de Miraflores has the largest number of risk factors and in a higher rate, but for GBV.

On the institutional side of the relations, the displaced families have the closest ties with ‘Healthcare centres’ (42.5%) and ‘Police stations’ (29.6%). The offices of the town council are reported in third place but just by 19.2%. As it happened in the previous round, the population remains unaware about ‘community kitchens’ and ‘vasos de leche service’. Two quarters of the population has received the support of any of these institutions, but it did not have an impact over the self-reported integration, which hints that this indicator is more linked to the coexistence with neighbours rather than to the treatment by the institutions at the moment.
12. PRIORITIES OF THE HOUSEHOLD

The top three priorities for the displaced families are ‘Food’, ‘Shelter’ and ‘Livelihoods’. With an overall rate of 59% Food needs are clearly the top concern for the displaced families. Shelter and Health have similar rates in the selection of the second priority, aligned with the challenging situation that families face in accessing decent living conditions and healthcare service in the middle of the pandemic. It consolidates as a pattern the low priority ‘Education’ has for the families despite the low rates of enrolment, especially for children below 5 years old.

Order of priorities does not significantly change by sex, age or civil status of the respondent, and it is only altered by the administrative status upon entrance. In this case, ‘Health’ and ‘Documentation’ become the most relevant categories for the third priority. It is important to remember that this round of monitoring identified more irregular entrances that did apply for the refugee status, which confers a stronger protection framework.
13. RECOMMENDATIONS

To the humanitarian community

» Reinforce the monitoring of risks and needs associated with single-parent HH.
» Promote school enrolment for children under 5 years old among displaced families.
» Expand legal counselling services to provide orientation and accompaniment in the process of regularizing residence and work permits.
» Increase communication and diffusion channels about the refugee registration process and facilitate access to the protection by the displaced family.
» Expand GBV response within the country and include referral channels to medical and psychosocial support services.
» Promote joint efforts between Shelter and Protection working group partners to assess the vulnerability of HH in relation to their housing and escalate/adjust the response.
» Expand monitoring of secondary and tertiary health care needs of the population.
» Enable protection channels (for example through individualized protection assistance or cash for protection) to cover the costs of emergency health care of families that cannot afford the service.
» Expand psychosocial support components in the response
» Reinforce and facilitate hygiene good practices are met with a conductive environment (WASH).

To the Peruvian authorities:

» Increase awareness and sensitization of border control authorities about human and refugee rights.
» Open investigative procedures in response to the accusations of extortion and abuse of power by authorities.
» Explore regulatory alternatives that simplify the documentation standards required to access regularized status in the country.
» Expand administrative exceptions to grant access to SIS to those suffering from incapacitating disabilities.
» Integrate more vulnerable subgroups of the Venezuelan population into the MIDIS state-run food supplementation programmes (such as community kitchens and 'vasos de leche service') to ensure access to nutritionally adequate food to mitigate the risk of worsening pre-existing serious medical conditions and reduce the use of negative coping mechanisms.