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INTRODUCTION

Background

Afghanistan is currently facing a major humanitarian and displacement crisis in the aftermath of over 40 years of conflict and integration of a new de-facto government. The most recent Humanitarian Needs Overview\(^1\) highlighted a significant displacement crisis. Since the beginning of 2021, 866,889 Afghans have returned to the country from Pakistan and Iran\(^2\) which is an increase in comparison to previous years. The number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) has also risen sharply. According to United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) findings, there are currently more than 600,000 IDPs and more than 80% are expected to be women and children.\(^3\) The combined challenges of COVID-19, severe drought and the plunging Afghani (AFN) have spun Afghanistan into a food crisis with 22.8 million people facing high levels of acute food insecurity further contributing to the current humanitarian crisis and displacement issues.

Following the influx of refugees and returnees from Pakistan and Iran since 2016, the UNHCR has supported these populations through programmes aimed at providing durable solutions for returnee and long-term displaced populations in Afghanistan. In line with the Solutions Strategy for Afghan Refugees (SSAR) and Comprehensive Refugees Framework (CCRF), 20 locations were identified by UNHCR as Priority Areas of Return and Reintegration (PARR) and in March 2021 IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) conducted an evaluation of the Community-based Protection and Solutions Programme Response (Co-PROSPER) and its impact within these PARR locations.

The Assessment

Since the completion of this assessment, 20 new PARR locations have been identified. Similarly, to the previously assessed PARR locations, the baseline for the new locations was conducted in areas where large numbers of refugee-returnees have been living side by side with internally displaced people (IDPs) and host communities. The assessment considered these population groups to understand if there were any need or programmatic impact disparities between the groups.

This booklet outlines the main findings from the baseline evaluation of the 20 PARR locations across Afghanistan. The findings are organized into six sections:

1. Demographics
2. Community leadership inclusivity
3. Community relations and stability
4. Strengthening public service and equitable access
5. PARR program support activity impact and
6. Income generation and economic profile

About the assessment

This assessment also sought to generate maps specifying service access and outlining village boundaries of the selected PARR locations. The maps identify services such as water points, healthcare centers, schools, mosques, markets, community centers and cemeteries as well as their functionality and identify any accessibility issues faced by the population.

In order to conduct this assessment, IMPACT used a mixed-method approach, using three structured tools with separate methodologies to assess each site as follows:

- Household (HH) interviews were used to interview a representative sample of HHs in each of the 20 new PARR locations, with a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error per PARR location. While aggregated to the overall HH level, results are representative of the population groups; IDPs, refugee-returnees, and host communities, and by the assessed locations. It should therefore be noted that findings per population group in the locations are indicative only at site level.

- Key Informant (KIs) interviews were conducted to assess community leadership in each of the 20 new PARR locations to provide indicative information on infrastructure, service presence, stakeholder presence, and conditions faced by specific displacement groups in each site. The KI survey also aimed to provide additional information on each site and location to complement HH survey findings. Nine KIs were interviewed in each location (except for two locations where certain population groups were absent).

- Participatory mapping focus group discussions (MFGD) were utilized to identify key infrastructure and service access boundaries in each site. The MFGD were conducted with the participation of KIs who were familiar with the specific qarya/gozars that the PARR locations were comprised of.

Between 21st November and 13th December 2021, 2,008 HHs, 174 KIs were interviewed and 46 MFGD were conducted across all 20 new PARR locations.

\(^1\) Afghanistan: Humanitarian Needs Overview 2021
\(^2\) OCHA, Afghanistan: Conflict Induced Displacement, as of 19 September 2021
\(^3\) UNHCR, as of 20 September 2021: Flash External Update: Afghanistan situation
\(^4\) IPC Acute Food Insecurity Analysis: Afghanistan September 2021 – March 2022
The baseline assessment aimed to fill key information gaps and provide a baseline on demographic change and service access in the new PARR locations. This evaluation was conducted through key informant (KI) and household (HH) level interviews, which aimed to gather information relating to three main population groups in the 20 PARR locations: refugee-returnees, IDPs, and host communities. It also included the use of participatory mapping focus group discussions (MFGD) which were conducted with KIs from the PARR locations. The KI and HH interviews were developed in coordination with UNHCR and were conducted using the Kobo collect on smartphones and tablets. In total, the assessment covered 20 sites across 20 districts in 19 provinces in Afghanistan.

**Data collection methods**

IMPACT used a three-step methodology for this project.

1) Household (HH) Interviews: Findings from the HH survey are population representative at site level and globally representative for each of the three displacement groups (IDPs, Returnees, and Host Community). Only HHs that identified as being either refugee-returnees, IDPs, or host community members were interviewed. The HH survey questions aimed to understand the current conditions regarding reintegration, service access, livelihoods opportunities, perceived inclusiveness of the local governance structures and movement intentions.

2) Key Informant (KI) Interviews: Key Informants (KIs) were interviewed to provide key demographic, sectoral, and accessibility information at the site level. In each location (except two where the population groups were absent) nine KIs were interviewed to provide in-depth insight. KI interview results are indicative, providing an indication of conditions faced by particular groups in each location, but did not provide a representative sample of the population.

3) Participatory Mapping Focus Group Discussions (MFGD): A participatory mapping tool was used to identify key services such as public water points, markets, health centers, schools, mosques, community centers and cemeteries. KIs from each PARR location were invited to take part to identify village boundaries and the accessible services within those boundaries by drawing the locations on a printed map of the PARR location. The information collected from this tool was then used to create maps identifying boundaries and their key infrastructure points.

**Populations of interest**

The baseline assessment aimed to understand the situation and needs of three target populations:

- Refugee-returnees: people who have fled their homes due to conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, who have crossed an internationally recognized state border and have since returned to their areas of origin.
- IDPs: people who have recently been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border.
- Host communities: people living in their place or area of origin.

**Sampling strategy**

The HH sample size was comprised of a representative sample of HHs in each of the 20 PARR locations, at a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. Results were representative of the population at a site level, and representative for each population group: IDPs, refugee-returnees, and host community at the overall (not location) level. To conduct the random sampling of HHs in each location, enumerators went to each location, where they started at the approximate edge of the PARR location, and walked towards the centre of the location, interviewing every “x” number of HHs at an interval determined by the size of the PARR location household population. This “x” number was different for each location and was equivalent to the total number of houses divided by the total sample size. Once the enumerators reached the middle of the location, they would walk back to where they started - skipping the same “x” number of HHs. Where possible, enumerators interviewed the head of the household, however when the head of the household was unavailable, another adult member of the household with in-depth knowledge of household affairs was asked to participate instead. It should be noted that in 16 of the 20 locations, female enumerators were present to conduct interviews for this assessment. In household interviews with female respondents, female enumerators conducted the interviews and vice versa with male enumerators conducting interviews with male respondents. The HH sampling frame is attached in Annex 3.

The key informants who took part in both the KI interviews and MFGDs were selected due to their in-depth understanding of the PARR areas. These were local leaders who may have been selected either formally or informally, and represented either refugee-returnees, IDPs, host communities, or a combination of these three groups. As such it was aimed to have 3 KIs per population group, for approximately 9 interviews for each of the 20 PARR locations.
However, in two locations one of the population groups was not present and therefore the group was not interviewed and the number of interviews conducted was lower. The selection process of KIs was carried out through collaboration with local organizations and contacts who also have in-depth knowledge about the PARR locations. Once IMPACTs team received the contact details, the potential KIs were contacted and asked if they would be interested in participating in the interviews and/or MFGD.

Analysis

All of the data was checked and cleaned daily in accordance with IMPACT Data Cleaning Minimum Standards Checklist. The IMPACT data unit downloaded data from the Kobo server, where enumerators uploaded their survey submissions. This data was then checked, cleaned, and analyzed by the assessment officer, operations and field teams, and data unit. Various checks verifying the logic of responses were conducted to preserve data quality and the answers were recorded in cleaning logs. Analysis was done according to the Data Analysis Plan which detailed how data would be reported, dis-aggregated, and aggregated (to national and regional levels); additionally, it contained calculations for four composite indicators measuring the four key themes (community leadership inclusivity, strengthening public services and access, livelihoods and economic outlook, and community relations and stability). For a more detailed overview of the four thematic composite indicators, please see Annex 1.

HH data was weighted based on the population per location, and data was reported as a percentage of responses representative of the population. KI data was analysed unweighted as a percentage of KI responses per location, hence KI data should be considered indicative, rather than representative.

The mapping of the PARR locations was completed using hard copy maps and a hard copy focus group discussion survey tool with an accompanying Kobo data collection tool for speed and accuracy. Data was first collected through MFGD where KIs from each village or neighbourhood were invited to locate key services and community boundaries on the map. The data was then entered directly into the Kobo tool to create a dataset. The infrastructure and community locations were digitized using ArcGIS. During the digitalization process, the map and dataset created through the Kobo tool were cross referenced with the digitized map data that was then linked with the database.

The baseline measured several key indicators calculated from the HH level data to determine the perspective of HHS on the access and quality of services, economic outlook, community relations and leadership accountability. These Likert scale questions were weighted depending on their severity and relevance, and subsequently the composite indicators were in turn combined to measure the indicators of the four key objectives. This allowed IMPACT to produce an index for each major indicator, which could be compared against the programme goals. For each composite indicator, the indicators were added up, with each question counting as equal weight, and were then normalized to a 0-1 scale. This scale was then broken into five ordinal categories: “high positive, positive, neutral, negative and high negative.”

Additionally, the vulnerability index of each household was calculated taking into account tazkera, demographics, livelihoods, markets and food security, ESNFI/HLP, humanitarian assistance, community support, protection and access to government services. Each composite indicator was weighted then calculated scores were then classified as “high risk, moderate high risk, moderate risk, lower risk.” For a more detailed overview please see Annex 2.

Although contributing to the vulnerability index measures of food security stress were also calculated separately. The reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) was calculated considering the frequency and severity of coping strategies which is then weighted and HHs are classified as “high, medium or low” within the index. Similarly the household hunger scale was also calculated weighting the related factors and classified HHs as suffering “severe hunger, moderate hunger or little hunger.”

Challenges and limitations

- The prevalence of the COVID-19 virus and related preventative measures induced logistical limitations and field staff were required to follow IMPACT’s SOPs for data collection during COVID-19.
- Due to no previous data collection for PARR being conducted in these specific areas prior, the majority of the enumerators were new and inexperienced. Despite the in-depth training, some enumerators still faced challenges during the data collection phase and some interviews had to be re-conducted.
- It is important to note that female head of households made up only 2.3% of the respondents. Therefore, keeping in mind that this may be a limitation for analysis, female-headed household findings are indicative, and may be underrepresented and some aspects should be treated as cautionary. For example, respondents that were asked questions about womens empowerment or economic outlook may have provided a gendered perspective that matches their life experience rather than the reality. In order to ensure that female voices were included, female enumerators were recruited to interview female household respondents in 16 of the 20 PARR locations. As a result, 25% of respondents in the HH survey were women.

6. IMPACT Data Cleaning Minimum Standards Checklist January 2020
7. Likert scale questions would have the following choices: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.
8. IMPACT SOPs for Data Collection during COVID-19
- The sampling methodology only allowed for stratified sampling between groups at a global level. As such, results from the HH surveys were representative only at the location and overall level for all population groups. Additionally, results are only indicative (not representative) when comparing results between population groups at the location level. KI findings are indicative only.
- This baseline assessment was conducted at the end of the year, as the weather transitions into the colder months and at the end of harvest season in many areas of Afghanistan. For some indicators, it is difficult to disaggregate from annual conditions and this may mean that conditions were potentially better at the time of data collection in comparison to other times in the year.
- The mapping assessment needed to be redesigned to eliminate the use of GPS equipment due to authorization being needed. This meant that the field team had to rely on the spatial knowledge of KIs to identify the points on the maps provided, despite some participants in the focus group discussion stating that this was the first time they had seen their area on a map.
- In some PARR locations community leaders represented more than one population group. It should therefore be taken into account that sometimes KIs spoke on behalf of groups they did not necessarily represent.
- Taking into account the current political and social situation in Afghanistan there may be an element of social desirability bias present in this assessment. Respondents may have reported in a way that made their area look more favorable and will be interpreted as positive. This may have been particularly influenced due to the enumerators representing IMPACT/ACTED and respondents therefore holding specific perceptions about how their information will be interpreted.
KEY FINDINGS

**Household Vulnerabilities**

- PARR Populations were on average about equal between the three demographic groups: 39% host community, 32% IDPs, and 29% returnees. With few exceptions, all three groups reported similar impressions of community leadership, service quality, economic outlook, and community relations, suggesting that all three faced similar overall conditions in the PARRs.

- Female-headed households generally reported lower positive perceptions towards reintegration prospects and the associated pillars. This was likely due to the notable lack of community participation, leadership, and economic opportunities that both male and female respondents reported for female headed households. Approximately 25% of female-headed households reported being widowed.

- Around a third (31%) of households reported that the head of household had some form of disability, much higher than the 8% reported by the Whole of Afghanistan Assessment (WoAA) in September 2021. The high overall prevalence was driven by a very high reported incidence in very specific locations, many of which were the site of conflict in the last year.

- Most returns (32%) reported being pressured to return; this was most common in the Central, Central Highlands, and Western Regions; a further 24% returned due to a lack of work opportunities, and 28% returned because it was safe to do so.

- The vast majority of households in the assessed PARRs intended to stay in the area; of the 5% intending to leave, almost half (41%) planned to leave the country, primarily for economic opportunities.

- According to the Household Hunger Scale (HHS), which is designed to assess severe food insecurity, most households (61%) were experiencing little to no hunger in the household, while 35% reported moderate hunger in the household. Severe hunger in the household was reported by 4% of households; while small, this was reported to be less than 1% by the WoA in September 2021. Key locations, including the PARR locations in Faizabad and Uruzgan reported severe HHS scores of 18% and 12%, respectively, indicating pockets of severe food insecurity. Furthermore, the reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI) categorized most households as high (70%) suggesting that most household are using extreme coping strategies and may be rapidly depleting their resilience.

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

- Most households in PARR locations had either highly positive (62%) or positive (14%) perceptions of their community leadership and reported leadership structures to be both accountable and inclusive of the households that they represented. In addition, 76% of households reported being aware of ways to provide feedback or complaints to community leadership, and a further 85% reported that they would go to community leadership in the event of a dispute within the community, suggesting high levels of legitimacy among the population.

- More neutral or negative impressions of community leadership were reported in the North East (66%), Central Highlands (87%), and to a lesser extent in the North (35%) and South (30%). These PARRs also reported poor perceptions of other indicators, including service access and community relations, suggesting that households may hold community leadership responsible for poor service delivery or livelihoods outcomes. Overall negative or neutral impressions were low, at 24% overall.

- Household perceptions of gender equality promotion within leadership were heavily regionalized but notably more negative than the perceptions of varying leadership aspects that were measured. Perceptions were more positive in PARRs in the Eastern and Central Regions, and negative in the Central Highlands, North East, South, and South East. Perceptions in the North and West were more mixed. It should be noted that social desirability bias may have contributed to the polarized results seen in the varying locations.

**Strengthening Public Services and Access**

- Household perceptions of service quality showed mixed views across the varying locations. Three quarters (73%) of households reported a positive or high positive perception of their access to public services. However, in the North and North eastern regions, households reported more negative perceptions. Generally, Shelter (79%) and Education (74%) access was positive or highly positive, while WASH (59%) and Health (56%) access was more mixed, and often differed regionally. Households in PARRs in the Central, North, North East, and South Regions consistently reported poorer service access than other regions. Female headed households as a group had worse access to services than male headed households.
• IDPs were much less likely to have received aid (30%) than returnees (46%) or host communities (40%) despite reporting similar overall levels of service access and living conditions. PARRs in the East (54%), North East (48%) and South (36%) reported being more likely to access aid, likely due to most of these locations being more easily accessible urban areas.

• The most common humanitarian support received was direct humanitarian assistance (51%) followed by livelihood support (37%) with most communities stating that livelihoods were their biggest problem and that there was a significant need for assistance and trainings related to this particular issue.

**Income Generation and Economic Empowerment**

• Households reported an average income of 7,911 AFN a month, which was inadequate compared to the average reported monthly household expenditure of 9,068 AFN. Most households (77%) reported going into debt to be able to meet their needs each month; of these households, average debt was 42,183 AFN.

• The main reported reason that households took on debt was to meet their basic needs; households reported going into debt to pay for basic needs like food (47%), followed by healthcare (21%). Analysis of expenditures found that food expenses constituted 50% of household expenditure, while 25% of expenditure was spent on healthcare, mainly in the purchase of medicine.

• The most common reported household livelihoods source was unskilled labour (33%); this was particularly common in the Central Highlands, North, North East, and West regions. Most IDP and returnee households reported that they had worked in agriculture before their displacement (41%), suggesting a continued trend of households displaced from rural areas who flee to cities for safety, but lack any marketable skills or land and must take unstable and poorly paying jobs in order to meet their needs.

• Almost two thirds (63%) of households reported that their income had decreased in the last three months; nearly all households (97%) reported that this was due to a reduction in employment opportunities. This appears to have had a direct impact on increasing vulnerability, reducing household’s abilities to purchase sufficient food and access basic needs.

• Perceptions of livelihood opportunities were worse than any of the other metrics; 69% of households reported either a neutral or negative perception of their economic and livelihoods outlook. More detailed measures, which questioned households on their perceptions found them to have neutral or negative perceptions of securing livelihoods opportunities (94%), accessing current or future work (57%) and their confidence in maintain secure employment and income (73%) were even more pessimistic. PARRs in the South and South East were even more likely to report these concerns.

• Most households had easy access to markets within 2km (76%). Combined with the vulnerability and household spending indicators, this suggests that food insecurity is more due to the increasing cost of food, rather than a lack of food in market or market access overall.

**Peacebuilding**

• Households reported a complex picture of cohesion between different groups within the PARRs, with 48% of households reporting that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that they could trust everyone in the PARR. This may be the result of substantial population movement and resettlement over the year that has required communities to make greater efforts towards integration. However, most households also reported that communication had improved over the last year (47%), and agreed that the community leadership were taking measures to improve relations (59%).

• Nearly half of all households (47%) reported that there were frequent disputes between members of the community. Most of these disputes were reported to be over land (80%), money (63%), or marriage (53%).

• Despite the presence of disputes, 82% of households had a positive or highly positive perception of security in their PARR location. Most households reported that they believed their communities to be safe, incidents of conflict were low, and that authorities were able to manage crime, disputes, and threats to the community when needed.
### DEMOGRAPHICS

- **Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:**
  - IDP: 32%
  - Refugee-Returnee: 29%
  - Host Community: 39%

- **Composition of assessed households**
  - Female (50%)
    - 1% 65+
    - 3% 50-64
    - 17% 18-49
    - 5% 16-17
  - Male (50%)
    - 1% 65+
    - 3% 50-64
    - 16% 18-49
    - 4% 16-17

---

### Movement Intentions

- **95% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.**

- **Of the 5% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:**
  - **Different country:** 41%
  - **Same province, different district:** 32%

- **Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:**
  - **Find work or better opportunities:** 73%
  - **Lack of housing/shelter:** 15%
  - **Safety/security:** 6%

---

### Refugee Returnees

- **Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location:** 9.3 year(s)

- **% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:**
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: 32%
  - Safety/security: 28%
  - Find work or better opportunities: 24%

---

### IDPs

- **Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:** 5.4 year(s)

- **Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:**
  - Nangarhar: 17% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

---

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

- **Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**
  - The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **% of households being reportedly female-headed:** 2%

- **% of households reporting their head of household has a disability:** 32%

- **% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:** 19%

---

### Womens Leadership

- **Womens Leadership Index**
  - The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **% of households reporting:**
  - Negative perception: 33%
  - Positive perception: 10%
  - Neutral perception: 12%
  - High positive perception: 45%
Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- 11% Negative perception
- 12% Neutral perception
- 37% Arbab/Malik only
- 11% Shuras for smaller groups
- 52% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 37% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 78% Elected by whole community
- 14% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 8% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- 15% Negative perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 65% High positive perception

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- In person: 91%
- Phone/SMS reporting line: 70%
- Shura meetings: 33%

92% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

Community Relations and Stability

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- 23% Usually they help each other
- 11% They always help each other
- 5% I do not know
- 22% They normally do, but not very often
- 3% Never
- 36% Few or very few times
- 0% Refuse to answer

% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community:

- 5% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

- 10% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

Education
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

17% Negative perception 8% Positive perception
8% Neutral perception 67% High positive perception

49% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.4,5

9% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.4
16% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.4

Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was: School is too far (77%)
Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: School is too far (63%)

Leadership of Service Provision
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

18% Negative perception 15% Positive perception
0% Neutral perception 67% High positive perception

53% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.5

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:3,6

Landowners 66%
Households 65%
Men 42%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:3,6

Community leadership 85%
Religious leader 59%
Households themselves 43%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:3,6

Land or shelter 80%
Money 63%
Marriage/relationships 53%

6% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.4,5

29% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.4,5

53% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.5

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 13% Negative perception
- 21% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 58% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): 76%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 18%
- Damaged house: 2%

68% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

94% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 34% Negative perception
- 8% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 52% High positive perception

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 38% Negative perception
- 8% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 47% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine: 97%
- Fees for treatment: 64%
- Travel to healthcare facilities: 57%

51% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

24% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

55% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- 13% Community development
- 9% Energy
- 18% Infrastructure
- 18% Shelter
- 15% WASH
- 0% Other

30% Agriculture
5% Computer training
32% Handcrafts
5% Languages
26% Teacher training
1% Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- 30% Agriculture
- 22% Business
- 32% Handcrafts
- 57% Healthcare
- 26% Teacher training
- 0% None

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 2% Lack of education access
- 1% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 6% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 80% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 1% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 50% Agriculture
- 21% Computer training
- 70% Handcrafts
- 3% Languages
- 18% Teacher training
- 63% Business
- 4% Cosmetics
- 36% Healthcare
- 3% Religious
- 0% Other
- 0% None
- 6% None

6% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 14% Negative perception
- 26% Positive perception
- 55% Neutral perception

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 50% Negative perception
- 18% Positive perception
- 23% Neutral perception

Women’s Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

- 18% Negative perception
- 11% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception

56% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

87% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 22%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 46%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 21%
- 5 or more years: 12%

17% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Village-based savings and lending: 90%
- Self help groups: 90%
- Bank/loans: 43%

51% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 84%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 59%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 52%

82% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

32% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- 44% Negative perception
- 3% Positive perception
- 50% Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households: 1

- Unskilled labour: 33%
- Small business/sales/rent: 18%
- Skilled labour: 14%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- 45% Negative perception
- 12% Neutral perception
- 25% Positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 7,928 AFN

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 9,067 AFN

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- 4% Severe hunger
- 35% Moderate hunger
- 61% Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- 70% High
- 22% Medium
- 7% Low

82% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

22% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

86% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

23% of households reported that they do not have debt.

76% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **12%** Negative perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **66%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **37%** Arbab/Malik only
- **11%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **52%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **69%** Elected by whole community
- **24%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **62%** High positive perception

% of households reporting that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location:

- **14%**

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

1. **In person**
   - **89%**
2. **Phone/SMS reporting line**
   - **67%**
3. **Shura meetings**
   - **41%**

**95%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

### Community Relations and Stability

#### Community Relations and Stability Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **21%** Positive perception
- **62%** High positive perception

#### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **31%** Positive perception
- **45%** High positive perception

Of the **69%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **20%** Most of the time
- **14%** About half the time
- **5%** Always
- **36%** Sometimes
- **25%** Very rarely
- **0%** Never

**26%** of KIs reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

**80%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

**9%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **10%** Negative perception
- **17%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **62%** High positive perception

Of the **53%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: **77%**
- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: **47%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **44%**

**52%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.\(^5\)

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:\(^3,4\)

- **Households**: 68%
- **Landowners**: 61%
- **Men**: 45%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three to whom they would report the issue were: \(^3,6\)

- **Community leadership**: 85%
- **Religious leader**: 63%
- **Households themselves**: 45%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were: \(^3,6\)

- **Land or shelter**: 80%
- **Money**: 59%
- **Marriage/relationships**: 55%

**8%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.\(^4,5\)

**25%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.\(^4,5\)

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services:

- **20%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **65%** High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **17%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **67%** High positive perception

**41%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.\(^4,5\)

**7%** of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.\(^4\)

Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was: **cannot afford to pay for school related costs (75%)**

**16%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.\(^4\)

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: **cultural reasons (78%)**

\(^3\) The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

\(^4\) Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

\(^5\) Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

\(^6\) Respondents could select up to three options.
Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 9% Negative perception
- 21% Positive perception
- 8% Neutral perception
- 62% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): 80%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 17%
- Damaged house: 2%

80% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

96% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 46% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 8% Neutral perception
- 39% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine: 96%
- Travel to healthcare facilities: 64%
- Fees for treatment: 63%

42% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

WASH

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 40% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 5% Neutral perception
- 48% High positive perception

45% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- 12% Community development
- 10% Energy
- 11% Infrastructure
- 17% Shelter
- 12% WASH
- 0% Other

- 19% Education
- 8% Health
- 47% Livelihoods
- 47% Special assistance
- 5% Don’t know
- 6% Nothing

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- 31% Agriculture
- 2% Computer training
- 32% Handcrafts
- 4% Languages
- 23% Teacher training
- 0% Other

- 26% Business
- 0% Cosmetics
- 63% Healthcare
- 1% Religious
- 0% None

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 3% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 9% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 74% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 1% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 56% Agriculture
- 14% Computer training
- 71% Handicrafts
- 2% Languages
- 15% Teacher training
- 2% None
- 6% None

6% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

### Income Generation and Economic Profile

**Income Generation and Economic Profile Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 14% Negative perception
- 28% Positive perception
- 52% Neutral perception
- 7% High positive perception

**Economic Outlook**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 47% Negative perception
- 18% Positive perception
- 23% Neutral perception
- 12% High positive perception

For 19% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (52%)

**Women's Empowerment**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- 19% Negative perception
- 10% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 62% High positive perception

54% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

86% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 18%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 44%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 24%
- 5 or more years: 15%

19% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Self help groups: 95%
- Village-based savings and lending: 88%
- Bank/loans: 39%

50% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 78%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 63%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 56%

84% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

30% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **35%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **59%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Unskilled labour: **34%**
- Small business/sales/rent: **22%**
- Skilled labour: **14%**

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **45%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **21%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **7,777 AFN**

Average household debt: **43,622 AFN**

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **2%** Severe hunger
- **34%** Moderate hunger
- **64%** Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **65%** High
- **23%** Medium
- **9%** Low

- **78%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **19%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **84%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **8,203 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:

- **2%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **2%** Rent
- **13%** Shelter repairs
- **12%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **2%** COVID-19
- **47%** Food
- **21%** Other

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **52%** Food
- **16%** Fuel/Electricity
- **4%** Rent
- **2%** Education costs
- **22%** Healthcare
- **2%** Debt repayment

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- **33%** Self-help groups
- **33%** Associations
- **33%** Cooperatives
- **33%** Other

- **72%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

1. The proportion of households surveyed, by population group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (50%)</td>
<td>Male (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only responses for host community are displayed.

Average household size: **9**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera¹</th>
<th>% of households being reportedly female-headed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27% All</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% Most²</td>
<td>% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% Few²</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the **7%** of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Same province, different district **60%**
- Different province **31%**

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- Find work or better opportunities **56%**
- Lack of housing/shelter **31%**
- Need to be with family **12%**

**IDPs**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:* **5.4 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location:* **3 year(s)**

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location*:

- Nangarhar **17%**

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:* **5.4 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location:* **3 year(s)**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative perception</th>
<th>Neutral perception</th>
<th>Positive perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 35% Arbab/Malik only
- 15% Shuras for smaller groups
- 50% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 82% Elected by whole community
- 8% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 10% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- In person 89%
- Phone/SMS reporting line 69%
- Shura meetings 33%

88% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually they help each other</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They always help each other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few or very few times</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They normally do, but not very often</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

80% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

13% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**
  - 9% Negative perception
  - 21% Neutral perception
  - 49% High positive perception

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **Safety, Security, and Stability Index**
  - 9% Negative perception
  - 65% High positive perception

### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **Education Index**
  - 18% Negative perception
  - 10% Positive perception
  - 64% High positive perception

### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **Leadership of Service Provision Index**
  - 19% Negative perception
  - 15% Positive perception
  - 66% High positive perception

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.  
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.  
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).  
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **38%** Negative perception  
- **8%** Positive perception  
- **7%** Neutral perception  
- **48%** High positive perception

**Healthcare**

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- **96%** Medicine
- **59%** Fees for treatment
- **50%** Travel to healthcare facilities

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **31%** Negative perception  
- **10%** Positive perception  
- **9%** Neutral perception  
- **51%** High positive perception

**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **19%** Negative perception  
- **19%** Positive perception  
- **10%** Neutral perception  
- **52%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **11%** Community development  
- **6%** Energy  
- **17%** Infrastructure  
- **25%** Shelter  
- **14%** WASH  
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **29%** Agriculture  
- **4%** Computer training  
- **25%** Handcrafts  
- **6%** Languages  
- **27%** Teacher training  
- **4%** Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.  
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.  
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).  
6. Respondents could select up to three options.  
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

2% Lack of education access 0% Lack of infrastructure
2% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations 2% Insecurity
6% Lack of adequate healthcare 7% Lack of clean water
83% Lack of livelihood opportunities 0% Lack of shelters
0% Unresponsive community leadership 0% Other

8% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

42% Agriculture 65% Business
22% Computer training 4% Cosmetics
70% Handcrafts 33% Healthcare
4% Languages 3% Religious
19% Teacher training 0% Other
3% None

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

15% Negative perception 25% Positive perception
56% Neutral perception 4% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

50% Negative perception 18% Positive perception
26% Neutral perception 6% High positive perception

For 14% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (54%)

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

20% Negative perception 13% Positive perception
9% Neutral perception 58% High positive perception

62% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

87% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 36%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 44%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 16%
- 5 or more years: 4%

12% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Self help groups: 95%
- Village-based savings and lending: 78%
- Bank/loans: 53%

57% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 90%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 59%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 51%

78% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

30% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **44%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **49%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:  
- Unskilled labour: **36%**
- Small business/sales/rent: **16%**
- Skilled labour: **14%**

Average number of bread winners per household: **1.3**

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **41%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **15%** Neutral perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **7,259 AFN**  
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **8,253 AFN**

19% of households reported that they do not have debt.  
Average household debt: **34,874 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:
- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: **3%**
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): **7%**
- Rent: **7%**
- Food: **49%**
- Shelter repairs: **5%**
- COVID-19: **7%**
- Wedding/Celebrations: **8%**
- Other: **20%**
- Healthcare: **20%**

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- Food: **51%**
- Fuel/Electricity: **11%**
- Education costs: **17%**
- Rent: **1%**
- Water: **2%**
- Debt repayment: **2%**

77% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- Government financial help: **21%**
- Government material help: **41%**
- UN/NGO financial help: **70%**
- UN/NGO material help: **40%**

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
- Self-help groups: **0%**
- Associations: **0%**
- Cooperatives: **33%**
- Other: **5%**

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **7%** Severe hunger
- **39%** Moderate hunger
- **54%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **73%** High
- **21%** Medium
- **4%** Low

86% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

25% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

86% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASED PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)

Refugee-returnee
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DEMOGRAPHICS

Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Female (50%)</th>
<th>Male (50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composition of assessed households

*Only responses for Refugee-returnee are displayed.*

Average household size: 10.1

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High vulnerability</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate vulnerability</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower vulnerability</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most²</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few²</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households being reportedly female-headed:

0%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:

34%

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:

21%

Movement Intentions

93% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.³

Of the 7% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Different country: 63%
- Different province: 19%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:³

- Find work or better opportunities: 88%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 6%
- Safety/security: 5%

Refugee Returnees

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: * 9.3 year(s) * 

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:³

- Lost legal status/forced to return: 32%
- Safety/security: 28%
- Find work or better opportunities: 24%

IDPs

% of households reporting the intention to move:

- Find work or better opportunities: 88%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 6%
- Safety/security: 5%

IDPs

Average household size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only responses for refugee-returnees are displayed.

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY

Community Leadership Inclusivity Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women’s Leadership

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **9%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **77%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **40%** Arbab/Malik only
- **7%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **53%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **85%** Elected by whole community
- **8%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **8%** Neutral perception

14% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- **94%** In person
- **74%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **24%** Shura meetings

92% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **5%** Negative perception
- **21%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **67%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **9%** Negative perception
- **34%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **47%** High positive perception

Of the 73% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **7%** Most of the time
- **24%** About half the time
- **44%** Sometimes
- **22%** Very rarely
- **4%** I do not know
- **2%** Never

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **19%** Usually they help each other
- **3%** Never
- **10%** They always help each other
- **45%** Few or very few times
- **4%** I do not know
- **0%** Refuse to answer

10% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

85% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

7% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **65%** High positive perception

Of the **46%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety **74%**
- Discrimination/harassment from other groups **53%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community **42%**

- **2%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.
- **34%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **6%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **61%** High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **17%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **70%** High positive perception

- **56%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

- **11%** of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.
- **16%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

- Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was: **School is too far (100%)**
- Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: **School is too far (67%)**

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
### Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **10%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **60%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **76%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **19%**
- Damaged house **2%**

67% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

96% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

### Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **28%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **56%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine **98%**
- Fees for treatment **70%**
- Travel to healthcare facilities **55%**

51% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

25% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

59% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

### WASH

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **28%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **57%** High positive perception

### PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **16%** Community development
- **9%** Energy
- **26%** Infrastructure
- **12%** Shelter
- **20%** WASH
- **2%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **29%** Agriculture
- **10%** Computer training
- **38%** Handcrafts
- **4%** Languages
- **31%** Teacher training
- **0%** Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 2% Lack of education access
- 1% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 3% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 83% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 1% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 51% Agriculture
- 29% Computer training
- 68% Handcrafts
- 4% Languages
- 22% Teacher training
- 2% None

3% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, everyday expenditures and economic variables:

- 13% Negative perception
- 59% Neutral perception
- 25% Positive perception
- 3% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 54% Negative perception
- 20% Neutral perception
- 18% Positive perception
- 8% High positive perception

For 26% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (51%)

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- 13% Negative perception
- 13% Neutral perception
- 11% Positive perception
- 63% High positive perception

51% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

86% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.  

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 16%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 50%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 20%
- 5 or more years: 14%

17% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Village-based savings and lending: 98%
- Self help groups: 83%
- Bank/loans: 44%

42% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 82%
- Lack of education or skills: 53%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 53%

83% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

39% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
### Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **57%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **38%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- Unskilled labour: **28%**
- Farming/agriculture: **19%**
- Small business/sales/rent: **16%**

Average number of bread winners per household: **1.4**

### Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **49%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **8,867 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **11,124 AFN**

#### Main reasons for households to be indebted:

- **2%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **5%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **1%** Rent
- **10%** Shelter repairs
- **14%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **22%** Healthcare
- **45%** Food
- **1%** COVID-19
- **0%** Other

#### Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **54%** Food
- **10%** Fuel/Electricity
- **9%** Rent
- **1%** Water
- **3%** Education costs
- **23%** Healthcare
- **1%** Debt repayment

### Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS),** the final categories of which are shown below:

- **3%** Severe hunger
- **33%** Moderate hunger
- **64%** Little hunger

### Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI),** high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **72%** High
- **21%** Medium
- **6%** Low

- **83%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.**
- **24%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.**
- **88%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.**

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**About IMPACT Initiatives**

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

December 2021

Central Region

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 43%</td>
<td>Female (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 32%</td>
<td>18% 18-49 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 25%</td>
<td>3% 16-17 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16% 5-15 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% 1-4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% &lt;1 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **8.2**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **70%** Moderate vulnerability
- **21%** Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:

- **25%** All
- **24%** Most
- **1%** None

% of households being reportedly female-headed:

- **0%**

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:

- **28%**
- **21%**

**Movement Intentions**

95% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.5

Of the 5% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Different province 50%
- Same province, different district 43%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- Lack of housing/shelter 36%
- Find work or better opportunities 35%
- Safety/security 29%

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **8.3 year(s)**

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:

- Lost legal status/forced to return 50%
- Find work or better opportunities 24%
- Safety/security 21%

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **5.1 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **3.2 year(s)**

% of refugee returnee households that reported their current location was not their first location of displacement: **23%**

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:

- Maidan Wardak

**IDPs**

Average household size: **8.2**

- **1%** <1
- **2%** 1-4
- **7%** 16-17
- **4%** 18-49
- **17%** 50-64
- **4%** 65+

- **1%** 1-4
- **7%** 5-15
- **16%** 16-17
- **23%** ≤50%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:

- **28%**
- **21%**

**COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **78%** High positive perception

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **18%** Neutral perception
- **59%** High positive perception

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **87%** High positive perception

**% of households reporting on their community representatives:**
- **22%** Arbab/Malik only
- **24%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **54%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

**% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:**
- **95%** Elected by whole community
- **1%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **4%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **5%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **85%** High positive perception

**% of households reporting that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location:**
- **6%** of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

**% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:**
- **In person**
  - **89%**
- **Phone/SMS reporting line**
  - **77%**
- **Shura meetings**
  - **38%**

**100%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **5%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **82%** High positive perception

### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **73%** High positive perception

Of the **89%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **6%** Most of the time
  - **22%** Sometimes
- **28%** About half the time
  - **44%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
  - **0%** Never

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

61% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

11% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

December 2021

36

IMPACT
Shaping practices. Influencing policies. Impacting lives.
**Baseline Evaluation of PARRS**

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **13%** Negative perception  
- **6%** Positive perception  
- **2%** Neutral perception  
- **79%** High positive perception

Of the **17%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **Other**  
- **Fear for personal safety**  
- **Government restrictions related to COVID-19**  

- **67%**  
- **33%**  
- **33%**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **10%** Negative perception  
- **33%** Positive perception  
- **42%** Neutral perception  
- **15%** High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

- **4%** Negative perception  
- **15%** Positive perception  
- **0%** Neutral perception  
- **81%** High positive perception

64% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.\(^5\)

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:\(^3,\(^6\)

- Landowners: **66%**
- Households: **64%**
- Men: **61%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:\(^3,\(^6\)

- Community leadership: **86%**
- Police: **26%**
- Households themselves: **16%**

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:\(^3,\(^6\)

- Land or shelter: **88%**
- Money: **53%**
- Marriage/relationships: **44%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:\(^3,\(^6\)

- Community leadership: **86%**
- Police: **26%**
- Households themselves: **16%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three reasons were:\(^3,\(^6\)

- Land or shelter: **88%**
- Money: **53%**
- Marriage/relationships: **44%**

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **63%** Negative perception  
- **8%** Positive perception  
- **7%** Neutral perception  
- **23%** High positive perception

56% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.\(^4,\(^5\)

33% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.\(^4\)

Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was: **cannot afford to pay for school related costs** (83%).

33% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.\(^4\)

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: **Low quality of education** (67%).

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **43%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **48%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **93%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **5%**
- Damaged house **1%**

**37%** of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

**98%** of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **41%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **41%** High positive perception

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **92%** Negative perception
- **1%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **3%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- **99%** Medicine
- **38%** Travel to healthcare facilities
- **23%** Fees for treatment

**56%** of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **0%** Community development
- **0%** Energy
- **21%** Infrastructure
- **0%** Shelter
- **24%** WASH
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **0%** Agriculture
- **0%** Computer training
- **0%** Handcrafts
- **25%** Languages
- **25%** Teacher training
- **25%** Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 2%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 0%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 8%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 86%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 0%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 38%
- Computer training: 41%
- Handcrafts: 75%
- Languages: 10%
- Teacher training: 4%
- None: 13%
- Business: 53%
- Cosmetics: 2%
- Healthcare: 20%
- Religious: 3%
- Other: 0%

% of households reporting that they did not receive assistance in the last year: 2%

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- Negative perception: 9%
- Neutral perception: 45%
- Positive perception: 35%
- High positive perception: 11%

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- Negative perception: 57%
- Neutral perception: 24%
- Positive perception: 13%
- High positive perception: 7%

For 3% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Agriculture, livestock (75%)

Women's Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- Negative perception: 5%
- Neutral perception: 13%
- Positive perception: 14%
- High positive perception: 69%

73% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 0%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 50%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 25%
- 5 or more years: 25%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in the Central region.

83% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 87%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 73%
- Lack of knowledge in registering a business: 40%

83% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

17% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.
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**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **36%** Negative perception
- **49%** Neutral perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **12%** High positive perception

**Top three primary sources of income reported by households:**
- Unskilled labour: **37%**
- Farming/agriculture: **23%**
- Skilled labour: **11%**

**Average number of bread winners per household:** **1.1**

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **36%** Negative perception
- **19%** Neutral perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **22%** High positive perception

**Average monthly income reported by households:** **5,589 AFN**

**Average monthly expenditure reported by households:** **9,122 AFN**

**11% of households reported that they do not have debt.**

**Average household debt:** **43,696 AFN**

**Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:**
- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: **3%**
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): **67%**
- Rent: **6%**
- Shelter repairs: **22%**
- COVID-19: **6%**
- Wedding/Celebrations: **0%**
- Other: **12%**
- Healthcare: **3%**

**Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:**
- **60%** Food
- **13%** Fuel/Electricity
- **3%** Rent
- **2%** Water
- **15%** Healthcare
- **6%** Debt repayment

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), with the final categories of which are shown below:

- **1%** Severe hunger
- **45%** Moderate hunger
- **54%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **81%** High
- **16%** Medium
- **2%** Low

- **100%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

- **28%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

- **100%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**UNHCR** Shaping practices. Influencing policies. Improving lives.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
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### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **52%** Negative perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **7%** High positive perception

% of households reporting that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.\(^5\)

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:\(^3,^6\)

- **99%** In person
- **72%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **1%** Shura meetings

**100%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.\(^5\)

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **36%** Neutral perception
- **16%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **1%** Arbab/Malik only
- **1%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **97%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **1%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **98%** Elected by whole community
- **2%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **0%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **58%** Positive perception
- **21%** Neutral perception
- **21%** High positive perception

### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **36%** Negative perception
- **25%** Positive perception
- **33%** Neutral perception
- **7%** High positive perception

Of the **100%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:\(^4,^5\)

- **11%** Most of the time
- **67%** Sometimes
- **22%** About half the time
- **0%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **0%** Never

**7%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.\(^4,^5\)

**100%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.\(^4,^5\)

**0%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.\(^4,^5\)

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **Safety, Security, and Stability**
  - 0% Negative perception, 24% Positive perception
  - 2% Neutral perception, 74% High positive perception

  Of the 0% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

  - **No key informants reported protection incidents in the Central-highlands region.**

  - 0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

  - 0% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

- **Leadership of Service Provision**
  - 57% Negative perception, 40% Positive perception
  - 0% Neutral perception, 3% High positive perception

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of the quality of and access to education in this location:

- **Education**
  - 3% Negative perception, 6% Positive perception
  - 4% Neutral perception, 87% High positive perception

  - 67% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

  - 0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

  - 0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

  - Key informants reported that both boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in the Central-highlands region.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): 98%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 2%

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine: 100%
- Travel to healthcare facilities: 20%
- Fees for treatment: 16%

100% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

67% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 0% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 100% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 43% Agriculture
- 91% Business
- 2% Computer training
- 18% Cosmetics
- 91% Handcrafts
- 12% Healthcare
- 0% Languages
- 0% Religious
- 0% Teacher training
- 0% Other
- 0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 2% Negative perception
- 67% Positive perception
- 19% Neutral perception
- 12% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 56% Negative perception
- 12% Positive perception
- 28% Neutral perception
- 4% High positive perception

For 3% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (100%)

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- 1% Negative perception
- 17% Positive perception
- 4% Neutral perception
- 78% High positive perception

85% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 0%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 67%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 33%
- 5 or more years: 0%

33% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Bank/loans: 100%

22% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- The family does not allow them to own a business: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 100%
- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%

22% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

78% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **39%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **46%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:*

- Unskilled labour: **61%**
- Skilled labour: **14%**
- Formal employment: private/public sector: **11%**

Average number of bread winners per household: **1.1**

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **29%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **5,626 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **8,075 AFN**

- **5%** of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: **51,552 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- **0%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **1%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **1%** Rent
- **2%** Shelter repairs
- **10%** Food
- **14%** COVID-19
- **9%** Other
- **63%** Education costs
- **6%** Rent
- **3%** Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **60%** Food
- **9%** Healthcare
- **15%** Rent
- **5%** Water
- **1%** Education costs
- **3%** Debt repayment

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **0%** Severe hunger
- **38%** Moderate hunger
- **62%** Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **91%** High
- **8%** Medium
- **1%** Low

- **89%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

- **0%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

- **89%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

5. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **79%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **40%** Arbab/Malik only
- **4%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **56%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **94%** Elected by whole community
- **2%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **4%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.\(^5\)

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:\(^3,6\)

- **97%** In person
- **75%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **28%** Shura meetings

**94%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.\(^4\)

### Community Relations and Stability

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **11%** Usually they help each other
- **5%** Never
- **2%** They always help each other
- **53%** Few or very few times
- **7%** I do not know
- **0%** Refuse to answer

- **4%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.\(^4,5\)

- **83%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.\(^4,5\)

- **3%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.\(^4,5\)

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 5% Negative perception
- 17% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 69% High positive perception

Of the 39% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: 86%
- Debt Related Concerns: 36%
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: 21%

19% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

17% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

#### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 2% Negative perception
- 13% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 78% High positive perception

#### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 4% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 79% High positive perception

14% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

13% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

3% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was: child had to earn money instead.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: School is too far.

### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 7% Negative perception
- 14% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 80% High positive perception

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **4%** Negative perception
- **17%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **71%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **74%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **20%**
- Makeshift shelter **4%**

Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:

- Written agreement **76%**
- Verbal agreement **19%**
- Prefer not to answer **2%**

74% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

96% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **15%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **69%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:6

- **20%** Community development
- **12%** Energy
- **19%** Infrastructure
- **13%** Shelter
- **18%** WASH7
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:6

- **37%** Agriculture
- **6%** Computer training
- **42%** Handcrafts
- **7%** Languages
- **35%** Teacher training
- **0%** Other

58% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

39% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.4,5

11% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.4,5

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **71%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:3

- Medicine **98%**
- Fees for treatment **69%**
- Travel to healthcare facilities **49%**

19% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.4,5

31% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4,5

28% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4,5

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 4%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 0%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 2%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 89%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 0%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 42%
- Computer training: 22%
- Handcrafts: 68%
- Languages: 4%
- Teacher training: 27%
- None: 1%

9% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 9% Negative perception
- 68% Neutral perception
- 22% Positive perception
- 0% High positive perception

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 57% Negative perception
- 19% Neutral perception
- 20% Positive perception
- 4% High positive perception

For 32% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (60%)

Women's Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- 5% Negative perception
- 10% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 75% High positive perception

89% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 18%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 41%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 25%
- 5 or more years: 16%

22% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Village-based savings and lending: 94%
- Self help groups: 94%
- Bank/loans: 44%

31% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 73%
- Lack of education or skills: 64%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 55%

83% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

33% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

51
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **57%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **42%** Neutral perception
- **0%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labour</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business/sales/rent</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled labour</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.4

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS),³ the final categories of which are shown below:

- **1%** Severe hunger
- **41%** Moderate hunger
- **57%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI),⁴ high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **80%** High
- **17%** Medium
- **2%** Low

- **86%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.⁴
- **6%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.⁴
- **83%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.⁵

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **56%** Negative perception
- **29%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **4%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **9,699 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **11,697 AFN**

15% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: **46,236 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

1% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
2% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
2% Rent
11% Shelter repairs
14% Education costs
36% COVID-19
28% Health care
1% Other

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **56%** Food
- **11%** Fuel/Electricity
- **6%** Rent
- **1%** Water
- **2%** Education costs
- **25%** Healthcare
- **1%** Debt repayment

76% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.⁵

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- **49%** Government financial help
- **58%** Government material help
- **53%** UN/NGO financial help
- **75%** UN/NGO material help

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.


---

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.

---
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### DEMOGRAPHICS

Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:

- IDP: 9%
- Refugee-Returnee: 0%
- Host Community: 91%

Composition of assessed households:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>(51%)</th>
<th>(50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **8.1**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **80%** Moderate vulnerability
- **9%** Moderate high vulnerability
- **11%** Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera*

- All: **20%**
- Most: **47%**
- Few: **30%**

% of households being reportedly female-headed: **0%**

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: **5%**

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: **2%**

### Movement Intentions

100% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.¹

No representative sample of households reported that they had movement intentions in the Northern region.

### Refugee Returnees

There was no refugee-returnee population interviewed in this location.

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: *4.4 year(s)* and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: *3.3 year(s)*

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:

- **Faryab**

  0% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.²

### COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

- **2%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **21%** Neutral perception
- **61%** High positive perception

% of households reporting who represents their community:

- **92%** Arbab/Malik only
- **3%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **5%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **0%** Elected by whole community
- **100%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **0%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

---

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **23%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **57%** High positive perception

8% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3, 6

- **99%** In person
- **64%** Shura meetings
- **61%** Phone/SMS reporting line

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

---

### Community Relations and Stability

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **53%** Usually they help each other
- **0%** Never
- **8%** They always help each other
- **11%** Few or very few times
- **27%** I do not know
- **2%** They normally do, but not very often

- **0%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community4, 5

- **100%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4, 5

- **0%** of KIs reported that they believed issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.4, 5

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **1%** Neutral perception
- **93%** High positive perception

Of the **0%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **No key informants reported protection incidents in the Northern region.**

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **17%** Negative perception
- **48%** Positive perception
- **36%** Neutral perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **35%** Negative perception
- **0%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **60%** High positive perception

- **100%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

- **0%** of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

- **0%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

**Key informants reported that both boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in the Northern region.**

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

1% Negative perception 13% Positive perception 6% Neutral perception 80% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

Permanent shelter (mud) 100%

95% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

100% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

98% Negative perception 0% Positive perception 2% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine 97%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 85%
- Fees for treatment 12%

100% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

100% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

11% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

91% Negative perception 1% Positive perception 8% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

100% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- Community development 0%
- Education 8%
- Energy 46%
- Health 0%
- Infrastructure 0%
- Livelihoods 0%
- Shelter 15%
- Special assistance 54%
- WASH 0%
- Don’t know 1%
- Other 0%
- Nothing 0%

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- Agriculture 0%
- Computer training 0%
- Handcrafts 67%
- Languages 0%
- Teacher training 33%
- Business 0%
- Cosmetics 0%
- Healthcare 0%
- Religious 0%
- None 0%

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 1% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 6% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 75% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 2% Unresponsive community leadership

- 0% Lack of infrastructure
- 0% Insecurity
- 16% Lack of clean water
- 0% Lack of shelters
- 0% Other

- 1% None

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 67% Agriculture
- 4% Computer training
- 82% Handcrafts
- 1% Languages
- 3% Teacher training
- 0% None
- 50% Business
- 0% Cosmetics
- 78% Healthcare
- 3% Religious
- 0% Other

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

### Income Generation and Economic Profile

#### Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women's Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

#### 100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 50%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 50%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 0%
- 5 or more years: 0%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in the Northern region.

#### 33% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of ability to travel alone: 100%
- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Lack of knowledge in registering a business: 100%

89% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

22% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

### Notes

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **78%** Neutral perception
- **4%** Positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:¹

- **Unskilled labour** 64%
- **Formal employment: private/public sector** 12%
- **Skilled labour** 10%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.1

---

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **91%** Negative perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **3%** Positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **5,271 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **5,859 AFN**

- **4%** of households reported that they do not have debt.

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- **0%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **1%** Rent
- **13%** Shelter repairs
- **5%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **7%** Healthcare
- **91%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.³

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- **0%** Government financial help
- **0%** Government material help
- **32%** UN/NGO financial help
- **90%** UN/NGO material help

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **63%** Food
- **22%** Fuel/Electricity
- **0%** Rent
- **2%** Water
- **10%** Healthcare
- **3%** Debt repayment

---

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **6%** Severe hunger
- **59%** Moderate hunger
- **35%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **77%** High
- **13%** Medium
- **8%** Low

100% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.⁴

11% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.⁵

100% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.⁶

---

1. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
2. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
3. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
4. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Of the 6% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
- Same province, different district: 60%
- Different country: 22%

5. Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
- Find work or better opportunities: 31%
- Need to be with family: 31%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 31%

6. Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: 1.4 year(s)

7. Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: 0.6 year(s)

8. The proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
- Find work or better opportunities: 31%
- Need to be with family: 31%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 31%

9. Average household size: 7

10. The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.
- 0% High vulnerability
- 20% Moderate high vulnerability
- 53% Moderate vulnerability
- 27% Lower vulnerability

11. % of households being reportedly female-headed:
- 0%

12. % of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:
- 27%

13. % of households reporting one or more members have a disability:
- 19%

14. % of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:
- All: 68%
- Most: 13%
- Few: 18%
- None: 1%

15. % of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement: 2%

16. Average household size:
- 1% 65+
- 1% 50-64
- 19% 18-49
- 6% 16-17
- 13% 5-15
- 9% 1-4
- 2% <1

17. Composition of assessed households
- Female (51%)
- Male (49%)
- 1% 65+
- 1% 50-64
- 19% 18-49
- 6% 16-17
- 13% 5-15
- 9% 1-4
- 2% <1

18. Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:
- IDP: 30%
- Refugee Returnee: 15%
- Host Community: 55%

19. Movement Intentions
- 94% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

20. Community Leadership Inclusivity Index

21. Community Leadership Inclusivity

22. The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.
- 42% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 25% Neutral perception
- 18% High positive perception

23. Womens Leadership

24. The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.
- 77% Negative perception
- 3% Positive perception
- 6% Neutral perception
- 15% High positive perception

25. The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.
- 42% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 25% Neutral perception
- 18% High positive perception

26. Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: 1.3 year(s)

27. Average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: 0.6 year(s)

28. Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
- Badakhshan

29. 2% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **35%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **23%** Neutral perception
- **35%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **0%** Arbab/Malik only
- **27%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **73%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **72%** Elected by whole community
- **21%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **41%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **27%** Neutral perception
- **28%** High positive perception

31% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- **82%** In person
- **75%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **44%** Community centers

92% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **19%** Negative perception
- **24%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **43%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **33%** Positive perception
- **15%** Neutral perception
- **39%** High positive perception

Of the **92%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **8%** Most of the time
- **54%** Sometimes
- **4%** About half the time
- **29%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **4%** Never

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community4,5

88% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

13% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
## Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **48%** High positive perception

Of the **96%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: **70%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **65%**
- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: **39%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Households: **97%**
- Landowners: **64%**
- Community leaders: **50%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: **80%**
- Religious leader: **80%**
- Households themselves: **42%**

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Land or shelter: **81%**
- Marriage/relationships: **72%**
- Crime/theft: **59%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Community leadership: **80%**
- Religious leader: **80%**
- Households themselves: **42%**

## Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access

### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **42%** Negative perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **38%** Neutral perception
- **6%** High positive perception

### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location:

- **25%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **61%** High positive perception

### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services:

- **68%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **24%** High positive perception

**Key informants reported that boys of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in the North-Eastern region.**

**14%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were **not** able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: cannot afford to pay for school related costs (100%)
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **51%** Negative perception
- **28%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **17%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **91%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **7%**
- Makeshift shelter **1%**

**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**

- Verbal agreement **50%**
- Written agreement **46%**
- Prefer not to answer **4%**

66% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

94% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **86%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **9%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **0%** Community development
- **3%** Energy
- **6%** Infrastructure
- **24%** Shelter
- **3%** WASH
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **11%** Agriculture
- **14%** Handcrafts
- **6%** Teacher training

- **2%** Religious
- **0%** None

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 4% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 10% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 75% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 74% Agriculture
- 69% Business
- 3% Computer training
- 95% Handcrafts
- 0% Languages
- 11% Teacher training
- 0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following assistance in the last year:

- 52% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, everyday expenditures and economic variables:

- 12% Negative perception
- 34% Positive perception
- 40% Neutral perception
- 14% High positive perception

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook:

- 44% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 32% Neutral perception
- 18% High positive perception

Women's Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook:

- 45% Negative perception
- 10% Positive perception
- 14% Neutral perception
- 31% High positive perception

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

1% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Village-based savings and lending: 100%
- Micro-finance: 50%

75% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 94%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 78%

92% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

13% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
# Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three primary sources of income reported by households: ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labour</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business/sales/rent</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal employment: private/public sector</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three sources of income reported by households: ²

Average number of bread winners per household: 1

# Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly income reported by households: 7,891 AFN

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 6,843 AFN

40% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: 42,389 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/Electricity</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education costs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt repayment</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses. ³

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government financial help</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government material help</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN/NGO financial help</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN/NGO material help</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help groups</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), ⁴ the final categories of which are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe hunger</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate hunger</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little hunger</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), ⁵ high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
2. Respondents could select up to three options.
4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
5. Respondents could select up to three options.

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
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**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 42%</td>
<td>Female (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **9.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera¹</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most²</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few²</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of households being reportedly female-headed: | 0% |
| % of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: | 33% |

**Movement Intentions**

95% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

Of the 5% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Different province 60%
- Same province, different district 33%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:³

- Find work or better opportunities 75%
- Safety/security 8%
- Lack of access to education 8%

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: *2 year(s)*

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:*
  - Safety/security 38%
  - Find work or better opportunities 24%
  - Came to be with family 24%

**IDPs**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: *2.5 year(s)* and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: *0.5 year(s)*

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:*
  - Helmand 17%

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability level</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High vulnerability</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate high vulnerability</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate vulnerability</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower vulnerability</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **9.2**

| % of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: | 23% |

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **64%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **54%** Arbab/Malik only
- **17%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **28%** Shuras for entire community
- **1%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **48%** Elected by whole community
- **11%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **41%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **71%** High positive perception

24% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- **84%** In person
- **49%** Community centers
- **47%** Phone/SMS reporting line

75% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

**COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND STABILITY**

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **13%** Neutral perception
- **58%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **10%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **13%** Neutral perception
- **62%** High positive perception

Of the 76% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:4

- **30%** Most of the time
- **42%** About half the time
- **3%** Always

Of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **64%** Neutral perception
- **14%** High positive perception

4,5 61% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

- **20%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community4,5

- **33%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **24%** Neutral perception
- **62%** Positive perception

Of the **70%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: **74%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **70%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: **52%**

**3%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**30%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**30%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **63%** High positive perception

**76%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **11%** Negative perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **88%** Positive perception
- **68%** High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

11% Negative perception 21% Positive perception

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **21%** Neutral perception
- **29%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Shelter</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged house</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional shelter</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

79% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **28%** Negative perception
- **13%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **50%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assistance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year.6

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Training</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

67% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.4,5

33% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from.4,5

27% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.4,5

33% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4,5

49% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4,5

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for treatment</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to healthcare facilities</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28% Negative perception

9% Positive perception

6% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception

3% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception

9% Positive perception

6% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception

4% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception

9% Positive perception

6% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception

9% Positive perception

6% Neutral perception

50% High positive perception
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 3%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 2%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 8%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 52%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 4%
- Lack of education access: 0%
- Lack of infrastructure: 0%
- Insecurity: 14%
- Lack of clean water: 18%
- Lack of shelters: 0%
- Agriculture: 59%
- Business: 50%
- Computer training: 21%
- Handcrafts: 39%
- Languages: 1%
- Teacher training: 30%
- Healthcare: 29%
- Religious: 3%
- Other: 0%
- None: 0%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 59%
- Business: 50%
- Computer training: 21%
- Handcrafts: 39%
- Languages: 1%
- Teacher training: 30%
- Healthcare: 29%
- Religious: 3%
- Other: 0%

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 3%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 2%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 8%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 52%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 4%
- Lack of education access: 0%
- Lack of infrastructure: 0%
- Insecurity: 14%
- Lack of clean water: 18%
- Lack of shelters: 0%
- Agriculture: 59%
- Business: 50%
- Computer training: 21%
- Handcrafts: 39%
- Languages: 1%
- Teacher training: 30%
- Healthcare: 29%
- Religious: 3%
- Other: 0%
- None: 0%

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- Negative perception: 43%
- Neutral perception: 34%
- Positive perception: 17%
- High positive perception: 6%

86% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days. 5

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 74%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 24%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 2%
- 5 or more years: 0%

11% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Community-based savings and lending: 68%
- Village-based savings and lending: 40%
- Self help groups: 40%

76% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows: 3,4

- Lack of access to financial resources: 64%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 64%
- Lack of education or skills: 60%

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.4

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.4

Women’s Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

- Negative perception: 63%
- Neutral perception: 9%
- Positive perception: 5%
- High positive perception: 24%

61% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.3

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

51% Negative perception  
7% Positive perception  
34% Neutral perception  
9% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:  
- Small business/sales/rent: 32%  
- Farming/agriculture: 18%  
- Unskilled labour: 17%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

40% Negative perception  
22% Positive perception  
25% Neutral perception  
13% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 5,120 AFN  
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 4,876 AFN

27% of households reported that they do not have debt.  
Average household debt: 27,369 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:  
- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: 10%  
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): 3%  
- Rent: 10%  
- Food: 39%  
- Shelter repairs: 9%  
- COVID-19: 1%  
- Other: 18%  
- Healthcare: 10%

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:  
- Food: 50%  
- Fuel/Electricity: 9%  
- Rent: 14%  
- Education costs: 1%  
- Water: 2%  
- Debt repayment: 23%  
- Healthcare: 2%

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- 6% Severe hunger  
- 40% Moderate hunger  
- 54% Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- 56% High  
- 28% Medium  
- 11% Low

97% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

36% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

91% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
### DEMOGRAPHICS

**Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:**
- IDP: 31%
- Refugee-Returnee: 28%
- Host Community: 41%

**Composition of assessed households:**
- Female (47%)
- Male (53%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average household size:** 10.3

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **High vulnerability:** 0%
- **Moderate high vulnerability:** 1%
- **Moderate vulnerability:** 29%
- **Lower vulnerability:** 70%

**% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:**
- All: 8%
- Most: 62%
- Few: 24%
- None: 0%

**Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:**
- Khost

**% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:**
- 4%

**% of households being reportedly female-headed:**
- 0%

**% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:**
- 11%

### Movement Intentions

100% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

No representative sample of households reported that they had movement intentions in the South-Eastern region.

### Refugee Returnees

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: *5.7 year(s)*

- Find work or better opportunities: 57%
- Safety/security: 21%
- Came to be with family: 14%

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: *6.8 year(s)* and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: *4.1 year(s)*

- 7% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- Negative perception: 0%
- Neutral perception: 2%
- Positive perception: 93%
- High positive perception: 90%

**Womens Leadership**
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- Negative perception: 15%
- Neutral perception: 9%
- Positive perception: 9%
- High positive perception: 17%

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- 50% Arbab/Malik only
- 50% Shuras for smaller groups
- 50% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- 52% Elected by whole community
- 48% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 0% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:
- Phone/SMS reporting line 78%
- Shura meetings 68%
- In person 66%

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- 21% Negative perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 90% Positive perception

Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- 21% Negative perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 20% Positive perception
- 49% High positive perception

Of the 100% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:
- 0% Most of the time
- 0% Sometimes
- 0% About half the time
- 100% Very rarely
- 0% Always
- 0% Never
**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 0% Negative perception
- 42% Positive perception
- 17% Neutral perception
- 41% High positive perception

13% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.5

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:3,6

- Households 82%
- Business owners 76%
- Men 56%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:3,6

- Community leadership 97%
- Religious leader 90%
- Households themselves 58%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:3,6

- Marriage/relationships 94%
- Business disagreements 72%
- Money 64%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:3,6

- Religious leader 90%
- Community leadership 97%
- Households themselves 58%

Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

- 0% Negative perception
- 2% Positive perception
- 98% High positive perception

Of the 89% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:3,4

- Fear for personal safety 100%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community 88%
- Debt Related Concerns 75%

22% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.4,5

100% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.4,5

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 2% Negative perception
- 12% Positive perception
- 3% Neutral perception
- 83% High positive perception

0% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.4,5

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.4

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.4

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in the South-Eastern region.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

78% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.4,5

0% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.4,5

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

Permanent shelter (fired bricks) 100%

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for treatment</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to healthcare facilities</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.4,5

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4,5

0% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4,5

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from.4,5

Of households reporting they spent money on water, in the last month, the top three water expenditures were for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

0% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

0% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:6

- Agriculture 0%
- Computer training 0%
- Handcrafts 0%
- Languages 0%
- Teacher training 0%
- Other 0%

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:5

- Community development 0%
- Energy 0%
- Infrastructure 0%
- Shelter 0%
- WASH 0%
- Other 0%

- Education 0%
- Health 0%
- Livelihoods 0%
- Special assistance 0%
- Don’t know 19%
- Nothing 0%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 2%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 2%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 22%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 60%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 3%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year: 6

- Agriculture: 48%
- Computer training: 48%
- Handicrafts: 54%
- Languages: 1%
- Teacher training: 8%
- None: 0%

% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year: 74%

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of infrastructur: 0%
- Insecurity: 9%
- Lack of clean water: 2%
- Lack of shelters: 0%

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Agriculture: 56%
- Business: 1%
- Cosmetics: 83%
- Healthcare: 1%
- Religious: 0%
- Other: 0%

% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year: 0%
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **87%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- Small business/sales/rent: 28%
- Formal employment: private/public sector: 27%
- Farming/agriculture: 17%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.5

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **0%** Severe hunger
- **0%** Moderate hunger
- **100%** Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **24%** High
- **75%** Medium
- **0%** Low

- **11%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **0%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **0%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **41%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **13%** Neutral perception
- **27%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 12,690 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 11,815 AFN

Average household debt: 15,609 AFN

- **54%** of households reported that they do not have debt.

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:
- **2%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **7%** Rent
- **33%** Shelter repairs
- **9%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **11%** Food
- **17%** Rent
- **15%** Fuel/Electricity
- **12%** Debt repayment
- **37%** Healthcare
- **80%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- **0%** Government financial help
- **0%** Government material help
- **0%** UN/NGO financial help
- **0%** UN/NGO material help

- **0%** Self-help groups
- **0%** Associations
- **33%** Other

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- 5% Negative perception
- 9% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 79% High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 44% Arbab/Malik only
- 15% Shuras for smaller groups
- 41% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 92% Elected by whole community
- 6% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 2% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

---

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- 8% Negative perception
- 12% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 71% High positive perception

16% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.\(^5\)

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:\(^3,6\)

- In person 85%
- Phone/SMS reporting line 57%
- Community centers 30%

94% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.\(^4\)

---

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- 1% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 4% Neutral perception
- 79% High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- 5% Negative perception
- 23% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 65% High positive perception

Of the 22% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:\(^4\)

- 19% Most of the time
- 42% Sometimes
- 11% About half the time
- 28% Very rarely
- 0% Always
- 0% Never

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS

Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 1% Negative perception
- 21% Positive perception
- 5% Neutral perception
- 73% High positive perception

Of the 39% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 79%
- Fear for personal safety: 43%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: 21%

85% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Households: 70%
- Men: 61%
- Landowners: 29%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: 80%
- Police: 73%
- Religious leader: 61%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Money: 73%
- Marriage/relationships: 64%
- Land or shelter: 51%

Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 20% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 64% High positive perception

Of the 39% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 79%
- Fear for personal safety: 43%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: 21%

4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
5. Respondents could select up to three options.

STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 15% Negative perception
- 12% Positive perception
- 12% Neutral perception
- 61% High positive perception

47% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in the Western region.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Households: 70%
- Men: 61%
- Landowners: 29%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
### Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **21%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **67%** High positive perception

**Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (fired bricks)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift shelter</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal agreement</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**56%** of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

**97%** of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

### Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **52%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **34%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- **Medical supplies**: 97%
- **Fees for treatment**: 56%
- **Travel to healthcare facilities**: 33%

**58%** of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

**0%** of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

**50%** of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

### WASH

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **35%** Negative perception
- **5%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **54%** High positive perception

### PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

**% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assistance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 2%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 0%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 9%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 76%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 0%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 43%
- Business: 61%
- Computer training: 19%
- Handcrafts: 71%
- Languages: 4%
- Teacher training: 11%
- Religious: 10%
- Teacher training: 1%
- Other: 0%
- None: 9%

9% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- Negative perception: 19%
- Positive perception: 21%
- Neutral perception: 57%
- High positive perception: 3%

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook:

- Negative perception: 55%
- Positive perception: 18%
- Neutral perception: 17%
- High positive perception: 11%

No representative sample of households reported that they owned businesses in the Western region.

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook:

- Negative perception: 16%
- Positive perception: 14%
- Neutral perception: 8%
- High positive perception: 63%

75% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

No representative sample of households reported that they owned businesses in the Western region.

36% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 15%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 15%

64% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

81% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
### Labour Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **46%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **49%** Neutral perception
- **2%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top three primary sources of income reported by households:</th>
<th>Average number of bread winners per household:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labour</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled labour</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business/sales/rent</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **55%** Negative perception
- **17%** Positive perception
- **18%** Neutral perception
- **10%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average monthly income reported by households:</th>
<th>Average monthly expenditure reported by households:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,995 AFN</td>
<td>5,178 AFN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter repairs</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding/Celebrations</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Hunger Score
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0% Severe hunger</th>
<th>17% Moderate hunger</th>
<th>83% Little hunger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Reduced Coping Strategies Index
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31% High</th>
<th>27% Medium</th>
<th>39% Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **56%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **36%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **83%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

About IMPACT INITIATIVES
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
#### DEMOGRAPHICS

**Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:**

- IDP: 30%
- Refugee-Returnee: 15%
- Host Community: 55%

**Composition of assessed households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female (51%)</th>
<th>Male (49%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average household size:** 7

**The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.**

- 0% High vulnerability
- 22% Moderate high vulnerability
- 52% Moderate vulnerability
- 27% Lower vulnerability

**% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:**

- 10% All
- 72% Most
- 18% Few

**% of households being reportedly female-headed:** 0%

**% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:** 27%

**94% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.**

Of the 6% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Same province, different district: 67%
- Different province: 17%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- Lack of housing/shelter: 33%
- Find work or better opportunities: 33%
- Need to be with family: 33%

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: 1.3 year(s)

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Came to be with family: 53%
  - Find work or better opportunities: 40%
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: 7%

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: 1.2 year(s) and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: 0.5 year(s)

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
  - Badakhshan: 0%

- % of IDP households that reported their current location was not their first location of displacement: 5%

**IDPs**

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: 1.2 year(s)

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative perception</th>
<th>Positive perception</th>
<th>Neutral perception</th>
<th>High positive perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative perception</th>
<th>Positive perception</th>
<th>Neutral perception</th>
<th>High positive perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **38%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **24%** Neutral perception
- **32%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **0%** Arbab/Malik only
- **27%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **73%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **69%** Elected by whole community
- **23%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **8%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **44%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **26%** High positive perception

% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- **In person**
  - **79%**
- **Phone/SMS reporting line**
  - **71%**
- **Shura meetings**
  - **47%**

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.9

### Community Relations and Stability

#### Community Relations and Stability Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **21%** Negative perception
- **24%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **42%** High positive perception

#### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **15%** Negative perception
- **35%** Positive perception
- **16%** Neutral perception
- **35%** High positive perception

Of the 100% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:4

- **0%** Most of the time
- **11%** Sometimes
- **11%** About half the time
- **67%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **11%** Never

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **Negative perception**: 24%
- **Positive perception**: 6%
- **Neutral perception**: 7%
- **High positive perception**: 63%

11% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

- **Boys of school age able to attend primary school**: 0%
- **Girls of school age able to attend primary school**: 0%

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were not able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in District 2, 5, & 6.

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

- **Negative perception**: 73%
- **Positive perception**: 7%
- **Neutral perception**: 0%
- **High positive perception**: 20%

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis.

- **Negative perception**: 46%
- **Positive perception**: 12%
- **Neutral perception**: 40%
- **High positive perception**: 3%

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **Negative perception**: 27%
- **Positive perception**: 14%
- **Neutral perception**: 11%
- **High positive perception**: 49%

48% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Households**: 98%
- **Landowners**: 62%
- **Community leaders**: 53%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **Religious leader**: 85%
- **Community leadership**: 79%
- **Households themselves**: 42%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **Land or shelter**: 79%
- **Marriage/relationships**: 74%
- **Crime/theft**: 60%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Fear for personal safety**: 100%
- **Discrimination/harassment from others groups**: 88%
- **Government restrictions related to COVID-19**: 50%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

56% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

27% reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in District 2, 5, & 6.

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Baseline Evaluation of PARRS**

**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **55%** Negative perception
- **29%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **95%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **5%**

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **94%** Negative perception
- **2%** Neutral perception
- **4%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Fees for treatment **93%**
- Medicine **90%**
- Travel to healthcare facilities **88%**

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **93%** Negative perception
- **0%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception

**PARR Programme Support Activity Impact**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **0%** Community development
- **0%** Education
- **6%** Energy
- **0%** Health
- **92%** Infrastructure
- **11%** Livelihoods
- **24%** Shelter
- **11%** Special assistance
- **2%** WASH
- **15%** Don't know
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **11%** Agriculture
- **11%** Handcrafts
- **21%** Business
- **84%** Healthcare
- **8%** Computer training
- **0%** Languages
- **0%** Religious
- **5%** Teacher training
- **0%** Other
- **0%** None

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Respondents could select up to three options.
5. Respondents could select the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

0% Lack of education access 0% Lack of infrastructure
4% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations 0% Insecurity
10% Lack of adequate healthcare 8% Lack of clean water
77% Lack of livelihood opportunities 0% Lack of shelters
0% Unresponsive community leadership 1% Other

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

79% Agriculture 69% Business
3% Computer training 1% Cosmetics
94% Handcrafts 31% Healthcare
0% Languages 4% Religious
10% Teacher training 0% Other
0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

13% Negative perception 32% Positive perception
42% Neutral perception 14% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

43% Negative perception 5% Positive perception
34% Neutral perception 19% High positive perception

For 3% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (100%)

Women’s Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

49% Negative perception 10% Positive perception
14% Neutral perception 28% High positive perception

50% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

Less than 1 year 33%
Between 1 and 3 years 67%
Between 3 and 5 years 0%
5 or more years 0%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in District 2, 5 & 6.

100% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

Lack of access to financial resources 100%
Lack of ability to travel alone 89%
The family does not allow them to own a business 78%

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **98%** Neutral perception
- **1%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- **Unskilled labour:** 55%
- **Small business/sales/rent:** 21%
- **Formal employment: private/public sector:** 15%

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **18%** Severe hunger
- **13%** Moderate hunger
- **69%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **66%** High
- **20%** Medium
- **12%** Low

- **100%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **0%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **100%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **13%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **1%** Neutral perception
- **60%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 7,876 AFN

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 6,914 AFN

- **43%** of households reported that they do not have debt.
- **40,052 AFN** Average household debt

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- **0%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **26%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **3%** Rent
- **50%** Food
- **2%** Shelter repairs
- **0%** COVID-19
- **9%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **0%** Other
- **10%** Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **32%** Food
- **18%** Fuel/Electricity
- **25%** Rent
- **3%** Water
- **5%** Education costs
- **19%** Healthcare
- **1%** Debt repayment

- **30%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- **3%** Government financial help
- **37%** Government material help
- **100%** UN/NGO financial help
- **19%** UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- **0%** Self-help groups
- **0%** Associations
- **0%** Cooperatives
- **33%** Other

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT (Initiatives) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 30%</td>
<td>Female (48%) Male (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP 30%</td>
<td>0% 65+ 2% 50-64 4% 18% 18-49 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP 30%</td>
<td>4% 16-17 13% 5-15 16% 9% 1-4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP 30%</td>
<td>2% &lt;1 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **6.9**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **54%** Moderate vulnerability
- **41%** Lower vulnerability

**% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:**
- **46%** All
- **34%** Most
- **20%** Few

**% of households being reportedly female-headed:**
- **0%**

**% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:**
- **15%**

**% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:**
- **7%**

### Movement Intentions

- **100%** of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

No representative sample of households reported that they had movement intentions in the Shamal Darya.

### Refugee Returnees

- Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **0.9 year(s)**
- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Came to be with family: **56%**
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: **44%**
  - Safety/security: **0%**

### IDPs

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **2.3 year(s)**
- Average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **1.7 year(s)**

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
  - **Badghis**

- % of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement: **3%**

### COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **5%** Negative perception
- **33%** Positive perception
- **16%** Neutral perception
- **47%** High positive perception

**Refugee Leadership**

- **88%** Negative perception
- **1%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **1%** High positive perception

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **9%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **77%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- **41%** Arbab/Malik only
- **3%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **56%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- **90%** Elected by whole community
- **9%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **1%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **4%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **80%** High positive perception

3% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6
- In person: **55%**
- Radio/Call centers: **54%**
- Phone/SMS reporting line: **40%**

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.9

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **68%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **17%** Negative perception
- **31%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **47%** High positive perception

Of the **33%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:4

- **56%** Most of the time
- **44%** Sometimes
- **0%** About half the time
- **0%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **0%** Never

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **19%** Usually they help each other
- **0%** Never
- **59%** They always help each other
- **7%** Few or very few times
- **0%** I do not know
- **15%** They normally do, but not very often

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.4,5

100% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

0% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access**

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 2% Negative perception
- 6% Neutral perception
- 26% Positive perception
- 66% High positive perception

Of the 78% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 100%
- Men: 84%
- Women: 48%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Police: 100%
- Community leadership: 77%
- Religious leader: 58%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Marriage/relationships: 77%
- Land or shelter: 74%
- Money: 74%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Police: 100%
- Community leadership: 77%
- Religious leader: 58%

Of the 78% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 100%
- Men: 84%
- Women: 48%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Police: 100%
- Community leadership: 77%
- Religious leader: 58%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Marriage/relationships: 77%
- Land or shelter: 74%
- Money: 74%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Police: 100%
- Community leadership: 77%
- Religious leader: 58%

Of the 78% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 100%
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**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 18% Negative perception
- 44% Positive perception
- 2% Neutral perception
- 37% High positive perception

**Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**
- Permanent shelter (mud): 96%
- Damaged house: 3%
- Tent: 1%

46% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

92% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 5% Negative perception
- 1% Positive perception
- 3% Neutral perception
- 91% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine: 100%
- Fees for treatment: 68%
- Travel to healthcare facilities: 41%

11% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

11% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 99% Negative perception
- 0% Positive perception
- 1% Neutral perception
- 0% High positive perception

92% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

89% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

100% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from.

11% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

11% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

- 4% Community development
- 0% Education
- 8% Health
- 67% Livelihoods
- 0% Special assistance
- 0% Don't know
- 13% Other
- 0% Nothing

- 25% Agriculture
- 0% Business
- 0% Computer training
- 25% Handcrafts
- 75% Languages
- 0% Healthcare
- 25% Religious
- 0% Teacher training
- 0% None
- 0% Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

1% Lack of education access 0% Lack of infrastructure
0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations 1% Insecurity
0% Lack of adequate healthcare 20% Lack of clean water
78% Lack of livelihood opportunities 0% Lack of shelters
0% Unresponsive community leadership 0% Other

13% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

61% Agriculture 59% Business
28% Computer training 1% Cosmetics
72% Handcrafts 4% Healthcare
5% Languages 4% Religious
12% Teacher training 0% Other
0% None

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

50% Negative perception 3% Positive perception
48% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

83% Negative perception 12% Positive perception
1% Neutral perception 4% High positive perception

Women’s Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

52% Negative perception 1% Positive perception
6% Neutral perception 42% High positive perception

76% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

78% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Most people do not want to buy from them because they are women: 29%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 14%

89% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

33% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **23%** Negative perception
- **0%** Positive perception
- **75%** Neutral perception
- **2%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- **Unskilled labour**: 64%
- **Skilled labour**: 15%
- **Farming/agriculture**: 11%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.1

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **0%** Severe hunger
- **26%** Moderate hunger
- **74%** Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **53%** High
- **43%** Medium
- **2%** Low

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **84%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **1%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **4,946 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **6,216 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:
- **0%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **15%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **0%** Rent
- **31%** Food
- **3%** Shelter repairs
- **0%** COVID-19
- **26%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **3%** Other
- **23%** Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- **54%** Food
- **19%** Fuel/Electricity
- **7%** Rent
- **9%** Water
- **9%** Education costs
- **2%** Debt repayment
- **2%** Healthcare

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- **0%** Government financial help
- **0%** Government material help
- **0%** UN/NGO financial help
- **0%** UN/NGO material help

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
### Demographics

#### Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Composition of assessed households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>18-49</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (48%)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average household size: 8.8

#### The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **2%** High vulnerability
- **43%** Moderate vulnerability
- **33%** Lower vulnerability

#### % of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera

- **8%** All
- **31%** Most
- **0%** None

#### % of households being reportedly female-headed:

- **0%**

#### % of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:

- **54%**

#### % of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:

- **29%**

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

#### Community Leadership Inclusivity Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **19%** Neutral perception
- **54%** High positive perception

### Movement Intentions

- **95%** of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

- Of the **5%** of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
  - Different province: 40%
  - Same province, different district: 40%

- Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
  - Lack of housing/shelter: 60%
  - Find work or better opportunities: 40%

### Refugee Returnees

- Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **7.1 year(s)**

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Find work or better opportunities: 71%
  - Came to be with family: 19%
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: 7%

### IDPs

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **4.7 year(s)**
  - and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **2.2 year(s)**

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
  - Baghlan: 29%

- 29% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

### Womens Leadership

- The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **27%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **52%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **18%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **21%** Neutral perception
- **49%** High positive perception

Of the **100%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **Other**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Landowners** 72%
- **Households** 52%
- **Men** 36%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **Community leadership** 84%
- **Civil courts** 68%
- **Religious leader** 64%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **Land or shelter** 92%
- **Marriage/relationships** 24%
- **Money** 12%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Landowners**
- **Households**
- **Men**

**75%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

**3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.**

**4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.**

**5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).**

**6. Respondents could select up to three options.**

---

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **74%** High positive perception

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **7%** Negative perception
- **27%** Positive perception
- **31%** Neutral perception
- **36%** High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **42%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **46%** High positive perception

**100%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

**0%** of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

**0%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Shahrk Mohajreen.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.
Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 3% Negative perception
- 26% Positive perception
- 2% Neutral perception
- 69% High positive perception

- 100% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.4,5
- 83% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from.4,5
- 100% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.4,5

Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 61% Negative perception
- 12% Neutral perception
- 4% Positive perception
- 22% High positive perception
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- 48% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

- 92% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

WASH

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 100%
- +102
- +255
- = 357
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- ++
- 100

- 29% Negative perception
- 26% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 36% High positive perception

- 0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4,5

- 83% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4,5

PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year.5

- 0% Community development
- 89% Energy
- 1% Infrastructure
- 31% Shelter
- 16% WASH7
- 1% Other
- 0% Education
- 1% Health
- 18% Livelihoods
- 28% Special assistance
- 11% Don't know
- 8% Nothing

- 63% Agriculture
- 0% Computer training
- 29% Handcrafts
- 0% Languages
- 0% Teacher training
- 4% Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market.6

- 4% Business
- 8% Cosmetics
- 17% Healthcare
- 0% Religious
- 0% None
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 9%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 3%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 7%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 64%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 0%
- Insecurity: 11%
- Lack of clean water: 16%
- Lack of shelters: 0%
- Teacher training: 9%
- Other: 0%
- None: 36%

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.5

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:
- Less than 1 year: 0%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 71%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 0%
- 5 or more years: 29%

29% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:
- Village-based savings and lending: 100%
- Micro-finance: 50%

0% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:3,4

Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Shahrk Mohajreen.

17% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.4

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 60%
- Business: 36%
- Computer training: 0%
- Handcrafts: 19%
- Languages: 46%
- Religious: 1%
- Teacher training: 0%
- None: 99%

8% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

For 7% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (71%)

16% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.3

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
### Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **59%** Negative perception
- **13%** Positive perception
- **18%** Neutral perception
- **9%** High positive perception

#### Top three primary sources of income reported by households: 1

- Unskilled labour: 32%
- Skilled labour: 20%
- Small business/sales/rent: 13%

#### Average number of bread winners per household:

- **1.4**

### Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **22%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **13%** Neutral perception
- **39%** High positive perception

#### Average monthly income reported by households:

- **11,004 AFN**

#### Average monthly expenditure reported by households:

- **10,302 AFN**

#### Average household debt:

- **57,890 AFN**

#### Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:

- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: 1%
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): 3%
- Rent: 3%
- Food: 25%
- Shelter repairs: 18%
- COVID-19: 14%
- Wedding/Celebrations: 7%
- Other: 29%

### Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **2%** Severe hunger
- **27%** Moderate hunger
- **71%** Little hunger

### Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **71%** High
- **25%** Medium
- **2%** Low

- **100%** of KIs reported that in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **100%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **100%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Movement Intentions**

93% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.\(^5\)

Of the 7% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
- Different country: 71%\(^5\)
- Different province: 29%\(^5\)

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
- Find work or better opportunities: 100%\(^3\)
- Safety/security: 0%\(^3\)
- Go to familiar place: 0%\(^3\)

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location:* 7.4 year(s)\(^4\)

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
- Lost legal status/forced to return: 63%\(^4\)
- Find work or better opportunities: 37%\(^4\)
- Safety/security: 0%\(^4\)

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:* 8.4 year(s)\(^4\) and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location:* 4 year(s)\(^4\)

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:*
- Bamyan: 28% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.\(^5\)

**IDPs**

Average household size: 6.7

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.
- 0% High vulnerability
- 5% Moderate high vulnerability
- 23% Lower vulnerability
- 72% Moderate vulnerability
- 3% All
- 2% One
- 67% Most\(^1\)
- 0% None
- 28% Few\(^2\)

% of households being reportedly female-headed: 0%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: 38%

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: 17%

**COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.
- 16% Negative perception
- 10% Positive perception
- 71% Neutral perception
- 3% High positive perception

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.
- 61% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 26% Neutral perception
- 6% High positive perception

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **36%** Neutral perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **16%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- **1%** Arbab/Malik only
- **1%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **97%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **1%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- **98%** Elected by whole community
- **2%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **0%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **58%** Positive perception
- **21%** High positive perception

Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **36%** Negative perception
- **33%** Neutral perception
- **25%** Positive perception
- **7%** High positive perception

Of the **100%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **11%** Most of the time
- **22%** About half the time
- **0%** Always
- **67%** Sometimes
- **0%** Very rarely
- **0%** Never

Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **52%** Negative perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **7%** High positive perception

% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location:

- **0%**

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- **99%** In person
- **72%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **1%** Shura meetings

**100%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

Community Relations and Stability Index

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **7%** Usually they help each other
- **0%** They always help each other
- **0%** I do not know
- **42%** They normally do, but not very often
- **1%** Never
- **51%** Few or very few times
- **0%** Refuse to answer

**0%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

**100%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

**0%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **24%** Positive perception
- **2%** Neutral perception
- **74%** High positive perception

Of the **0%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were: 3, 4

**No key informants reported protection incidents in the Tapa Whadat.**

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

#### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **0%** Negative perception
- **34%** Positive perception
- **1%** Neutral perception
- **65%** High positive perception

#### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **87%** High positive perception

**67%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education. 3, 4

#### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **57%** Negative perception
- **40%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **3%** High positive perception

**41%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community. 5

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were: 3, 6

- **80%** Men
- **57%** Community leaders
- **50%** Youth

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were: 3, 6

- **98%** Households themselves
- **80%** Religious leader
- **77%** Community leadership

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were: 3, 6

- **85%** Land or shelter
- **62%** Money
- **32%** Crime/theft

**0%** of KIs reported that there had not been disputes in the local community. 5

**41%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community. 5

**3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.**

**4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.**

**5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).**

**6. Respondents could select up to three options.**

**UNHCR**

**The UN Refugee Agency**

**IMPACT**

Shaping practices. Influencing policies. Impacting lives.
**SHELTER AND LAND TENURE**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **13%** Neutral perception
- **78%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): **98%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): **2%**

41% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

95% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **11%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **15%** Neutral perception
- **59%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **7%** Community development
- **7%** Energy
- **7%** Infrastructure
- **7%** Shelter
- **0%** WASH
- **0%** Other

- **0%** Education
- **0%** Health
- **79%** Livelihoods
- **14%** Special assistance
- **1%** Don't know
- **0%** Nothing

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **10%** Agriculture
- **0%** Computer training
- **0%** Handcrafts
- **0%** Languages
- **0%** Teacher training
- **10%** Other

**HEALTHCARE**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **5%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **64%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- **Medicine**: 100%
- **Travel to healthcare facilities**: 20%
- **Fees for treatment**: 16%

100% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

67% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 0% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

- 63% Lack of infrastructure
- 37% Lack of clean water
- 2% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Teacher training
- 0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 43% Agriculture
- 2% Computer training
- 91% Business
- 18% Cosmetics
- 91% Handcrafts
- 12% Healthcare
- 0% Languages
- 0% Religious
- 0% Teacher training
- 0% Other

- 0% None

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- 0% Less than 1 year
- 67% Between 1 and 3 years
- 33% Between 3 and 5 years
- 0% 5 or more years

33% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Bank/loans: 100%

22% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- The family does not allow them to own a business: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 100%
- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%

22% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

78% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:¹
- Unskilled labour: 61%
- Skilled labour: 14%
- Formal employment: private/public sector: 11%

Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly income reported by households: 5,626 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 8,075 AFN

Household Hunger Score
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS),² the final categories of which are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunger Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduced Coping Strategies Index
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI),³ high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About IMPACT INITIATIVES
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASED PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)
Farah Province, Farah City District, Afghanistan
Mahajerbad
December 2021

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
<th>% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>42% All 53% Most² 5% Few²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (43%) Male (57%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 65+ 4% 50-64 18% 18-49 4% 16-17 7% 5-15 6% 1-4 5% &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average household size: 8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% High vulnerability 49% Moderate vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% Moderate high vulnerability 52% Lower vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households being reportedly female-headed: 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Movement Intentions**

- 53% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.
- Of the 48% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
  - Different country 88%
  - Different province 10%
- Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
  - Find work or better opportunities 100%

**Refugee Returnees**

- Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: *3.6 year(s)*
- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Came to be with family 44%
  - Lost legal status/forced to return 44%
  - Find work or better opportunities 8%

**IDPs**

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: *6.4 year(s)*
- The average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: *4.3 year(s)*
- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location: Farah
- 50% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

- The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

  | 0% Negative perception | 20% Positive perception | 6% Neutral perception | 74% High positive perception |

**Womens Leadership**

- The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

  | 3% Negative perception | 18% Positive perception | 20% Neutral perception | 59% High positive perception |

---

¹ A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
² Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
³ The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND STABILITY**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **83%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **19%** Arbab/Malik only
- **8%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **73%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **77%** Elected by whole community
- **16%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **62%** High positive perception

% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.\(^5\)

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:\(^3,6\)

- In person: **86%**
- Shura meetings: **84%**
- Phone/SMS reporting line: **69%**

**100%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.\(^4\)

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **60%** Usually they help each other
- **0%** Never
- **16%** They always help each other
- **9%** Few or very few times
- **1%** I do not know
- **14%** They normally do, but not very often

**0%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.\(^4,5\)

**100%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.\(^4,5\)

**0%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.\(^4,5\)

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

## Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Positive</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the **0%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were: 3, 4

**No key informants reported protection incidents in the Mahajerabad.**

## Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access

### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Positive</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Positive</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Positive</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education. 4, 5

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school. 5

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school. 4

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Mahajerabad.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**
  - Permanent shelter (mud): 76%
  - Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 11%
  - Makeshift shelter: 11%

80% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

- **Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**
  - Written agreement: 70%
  - Verbal agreement: 30%

98% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

### Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **Proportion of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:**
  - Medicine: 96%
  - Fees for treatment: 56%
  - Travel to healthcare facilities: 55%

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- **WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **Shelter and Land Tenure**

11% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

22% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

0% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.

### PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- Community development: 0%
- Energy: 0%
- Infrastructure: 0%
- Shelter: 0%
- WASH: 50%
- Other: 0%

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- Agriculture: 50%
- Computer training: 0%
- Handcrafts: 0%
- Languages: 0%
- Teacher training: 0%
- Other: 0%

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- Business: 0%
- Cosmetics: 0%
- Healthcare: 0%
- Religious: 0%
- None: 50%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 1% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 4% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 69% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

- 0% Lack of infrastructure
- 0% Insecurity
- 26% Lack of clean water
- 0% Lack of shelters
- 0% Other

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 61% Agriculture
- 10% Computer training
- 79% Handcrafts
- 3% Languages
- 22% Teacher training
- 0% None

- 59% Business
- 32% Cosmetics
- 34% Healthcare
- 0% Religious
- 0% Other

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 14% Negative perception
- 27% Positive perception
- 59% Neutral perception
- 0% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 39% Negative perception
- 20% Positive perception
- 35% Neutral perception
- 7% High positive perception

Women’s Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

- 4% Negative perception
- 34% Positive perception
- 16% Neutral perception
- 47% High positive perception

66% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

No representative sample of households reported that they owned businesses in Mahajerabad.

No representative sample of households reported that they owned businesses in Mahajerabad.

0% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Mahajerabad.

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

89% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **45%** Negative perception
- **17%** Positive perception
- **35%** Neutral perception
- **4%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:¹

- Unskilled labour: **40%**
- Skilled labour: **25%**
- Formal private/public sector: **13%**

Average number of bread winners per household: **1.1**

**Household Hunger Score**
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS),² the final categories of which are shown below:

- **0%** Severe hunger
- **25%** Moderate hunger
- **75%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI),³ high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **52%** High
- **2%** Medium
- **47%** Low

- **89%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

- **67%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

- **100%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

**Economic Vulnerabilities**
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **49%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **37%** Neutral perception
- **6%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **5,425 AFN**
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **4,864 AFN**

Average household debt: **19,947 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:

- **9%** Rent
- **13%** Shelter repairs
- **21%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **53%** Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **41%** Food
- **20%** Fuel/Electricity
- **12%** Rent
- **0%** Water
- **24%** Healthcare
- **0%** Debt repayment

- **89%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- **0%** Government financial help
- **0%** Government material help
- **0%** UN/NGO financial help
- **0%** UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- **0%** Self-help groups
- **0%** Associations
- **33%** Other

---

¹. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
². Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
³. Respondents could select from the following yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
4. Respondents could select up to three options.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
The following is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **80%** Moderate vulnerability
- **11%** Lower vulnerability

### Refugees Returnees

There was no refugee-returnee population interviewed in this location.

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **4.4 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **3.3 year(s)**

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location: **Faryab**

0% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

### Community Leadership Inclusivity Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **12%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **23%** Neutral perception

### Womens Leadership

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **37%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **25%** Neutral perception
- **30%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the IRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **% of households reporting on their community representatives:**
  - 92% Arbab/Malik only
  - 3% Shuras for smaller groups
  - 5% Shuras for entire community
  - 0% No one
  - 0% Other

- **% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:**
  - 0% Elected by whole community
  - 100% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
  - 0% Appointed by other leaders
  - 0% Other

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **% of respondents:**
  - 0% Negative perception
  - 10% Positive perception
  - 6% Neutral perception
  - 84% High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **% of respondents:**
  - 9% Negative perception
  - 10% Neutral perception
  - 24% Positive perception
  - 57% High positive perception

Of the 67% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- 0% Most of the time
- 67% Sometimes
- 22% About half the time
- 11% Very rarely
- 0% Always

- **% of respondents:**
  - 0% Negative perception
  - 24% Positive perception
  - 10% Neutral perception
  - 23% High positive perception

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
5. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 0% Negative perception
- 6% Positive perception
- 1% Neutral perception
- 93% High positive perception

Of the 0% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were: 3, 4

**No key informants reported protection incidents in Damqol, Yaka Toot.**

78% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community. 5

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were: 3, 6

- Community leaders 77%
- Men 73%
- Households 73%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three to whom they would report the issue were: 3, 6

- Religious leader 73%
- Community leadership 68%
- Households themselves 59%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were: 3, 6

- Money 86%
- Land or shelter 36%
- Marriage/relationships 0%

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 17% Negative perception
- 48% Positive perception
- 36% Neutral perception
- 0% High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 8% Negative perception
- 23% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 69% High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 35% Negative perception
- 0% Positive perception
- 5% Neutral perception
- 60% High positive perception

100% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education. 6

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school. 4

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school. 4

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Damqol, Yaka Toot.
BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS

Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

100% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.\(^4,5\)

0% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.\(^4,5\)

11% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.\(^4,5\)

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

98% Negative perception 0% Positive perception

2% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:\(^3\)

- Medicine 97%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 85%
- Fees for treatment 12%

100% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.\(^4,5\)

100% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.\(^4,5\)

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

91% Negative perception 1% Positive perception

8% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

100% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.\(^5\)

100% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.\(^4,5\)

100% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.\(^4,5\)

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year.\(^6\)

- Community development 0%
- Energy 46%
- Infrastructure 0%
- Shelter 15%
- WASH\(^7\) 0%
- Other 0%

- Education 8%
- Health 0%
- Livelihoods 0%
- Special assistance 54%
- Don’t know 1%
- Nothing 0%

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market.\(^6\)

- Agriculture 0%
- Computer training 0%
- Handcrafts 67%
- Languages 0%
- Teacher training 33%
- Other 0%

- Business 0%
- Cosmetics 0%
- Healthcare 0%
- Religious 0%
- None 0%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

1% Lack of education access 0% Lack of infrastructure
0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations 0% Insecurity
6% Lack of adequate healthcare 16% Lack of clean water
75% Lack of livelihood opportunities 0% Lack of shelters
2% Unresponsive community leadership 0% Other

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

67% Agriculture 50% Business
4% Computer training 0% Cosmetics
82% Handcrafts 78% Healthcare
1% Languages 3% Religious
3% Teacher training 0% Other
0% None
0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

Income Generation and Economic Profile

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

6% Negative perception 6% Positive perception
87% Neutral perception 1% High positive perception

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

55% Negative perception 11% Positive perception
34% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

For 2% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Agriculture, livestock (100%)

Women’s Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

2% Negative perception 5% Positive perception
5% Neutral perception 88% High positive perception

86% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

Less than 1 year 50% 50% 0%
Between 1 and 3 years 50% 0% 0%
Between 3 and 5 years 0% 0% 0%
5 or more years 0% 0% 0%

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Damqol, Yaka Toot.

33% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

Lack of ability to travel alone 100%
Lack of knowledge in registering a business 100%
Lack of access to financial resources 100%

89% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

22% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same support access for their businesses as men.

The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

18% Negative perception 4% Positive perception
78% Neutral perception 0% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:¹

- Unskilled labour 64%
- Formal employment: private/public sector 12%
- Skilled labour 10%

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS),² the final categories of which are shown below:

- 6% Severe hunger
- 59% Moderate hunger
- 35% Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI),³ high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- 77% High
- 13% Medium
- 8% Low

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

91% Negative perception 3% Positive perception
5% Neutral perception 1% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 5,271 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 5,859 AFN

4% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: 35,830 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:

- 0% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- 1% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- 13% Rent
- 0% Food
- 7% Shelter repairs
- 0% COVID-19
- 5% Wedding/Celebrations
- 0% Other
- 7% Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- 63% Food
- 22% Fuel/Electricity
- 0% Rent
- 2% Water
- 0% Education costs
- 10% Healthcare
- 3% Debt repayment

81% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.⁴

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- 0% Government financial help
- 0% Government material help
- 32% UN/NGO financial help
- 90% UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- 0% Self-help groups
- 0% Associations
- 0% Cooperatives
- 33% Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Female (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **7.4**

- The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.
- **0%** High vulnerability
- **50%** Moderate vulnerability
- **1%** Moderate high vulnerability
- **50%** Lower vulnerability

- **16%** All
- **67%** Most
- **0%** None
- **18%** Few

- **13%** % of households reporting that one or more members have a disability
- **3%** % of households reporting that their head of household has a disability
- **0%** % of households being reportedly female-headed

**Movement Intentions**

- **89%** of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

- Of the **11%** of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
  - Different province: **91%**
  - Different country: **9%**

- Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
  - Find work or better opportunities: **100%**

**Refugee Returnees**

- Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **3 year(s)**
- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Came to be with family: **53%**
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: **41%**
  - Safety/security: **6%**

**IDPs**

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **4.5 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **2.1 year(s)**

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
  - Ghor: **12%**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **2%** Neutral perception
- **81%** High positive perception

**Women's Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **13%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **66%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

5% Negative perception 1% Positive perception
1% Neutral perception 93% High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 4% Arbab/Malik only
- 16% Shuras for smaller groups
- 80% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 90% Elected by whole community
- 3% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 7% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the responsiveness of community leadership.

13% Negative perception 2% Positive perception
4% Neutral perception 80% High positive perception

10% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- 80% AWAAZ
- 73% In person
- 65% Shura meetings

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- 38% Usually they help each other
- 27% They always help each other
- 0% I do not know
- 31% They normally do, but not very often

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community4,5

78% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

0% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **0%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **1%** Neutral perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services:

- **3%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location:

- **8%** Negative perception
- **1%** Positive perception
- **2%** Neutral perception

- **93%** High positive perception

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **32%** High positive perception

Of the **67%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **Fear for personal safety**: 100%
- **Government restrictions related to COVID-19**: 67%
- **Discrimination / harassment from others groups**: 50%

**Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:**

- **Men**: 74%
- **Households**: 73%
- **Youth**: 44%

**Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three reasons were:**

- **Land or shelter**: 76%
- **Marriage/relationships**: 76%
- **Money**: 74%

**Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:**

- **Police**: 98%
- **Households themselves**: 65%
- **Civil courts**: 57%

**36%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Men**: 74%
- **Households**: 73%
- **Youth**: 44%

**Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:**

- **Land or shelter**: 76%
- **Marriage/relationships**: 76%
- **Money**: 74%

**Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:**

- **Police**: 98%
- **Households themselves**: 65%
- **Civil courts**: 57%

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Shahrak-e-Amir Shansab.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**Shelter and Land Tenure**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

-**Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**
  - Permanent shelter (mud): 98%
  - Damaged house: 2%

-**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**
  - Written agreement: 54%
  - Verbal agreement: 44%
  - Prefer not to answer: 2%

-**59%** of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

-**85%** of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of water and sanitation in this location.

- 1% Negative perception
- 1% Positive perception
- 98% High positive perception

**Healthcare**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 8% Negative perception
- 1% Positive perception
- 91% High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:†</th>
<th>% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:§</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6% Community development</td>
<td>71% Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Energy</td>
<td>46% Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Infrastructure</td>
<td>8% Computer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% Shelter</td>
<td>4% Handcrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78% WASH7</td>
<td>4% Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78% WASH7</td>
<td>13% Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Other</td>
<td>0% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- †The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
- §Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
- † Respondents could select up to three options.
- ‡ Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
- 6. Respondents could select up to three options.
BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS

December 2021

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- **6%** Lack of education access
- **0%** Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- **9%** Lack of adequate healthcare
- **79%** Lack of livelihood opportunities
- **3%** Unresponsive community leadership
- **28%** Agriculture
- **12%** Computer training
- **87%** Handcrafts
- **1%** Languages
- **10%** Teacher training
- **0%** None
- **0%** None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- **28%** Agriculture
- **12%** Computer training
- **87%** Handcrafts
- **1%** Languages
- **10%** Teacher training
- **0%** None
- **96%** Business
- **22%** Cosmetics
- **12%** Healthcare
- **9%** Religious
- **0%** Other

0% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- **6%** Lack of education access
- **0%** Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- **9%** Lack of adequate healthcare
- **79%** Lack of livelihood opportunities
- **3%** Unresponsive community leadership

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- **4%** Negative perception
- **54%** Positive perception
- **27%** Neutral perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- **41%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception

For **2%** of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: *Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (100%)*

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- **9%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception

- **44%** of households reported that they were *not* aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

- **100%** of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- **100%** Less than 1 year
- **0%** Between 1 and 3 years
- **0%** Between 3 and 5 years
- **0%** 5 or more years

- **0%** of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- **No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Shahrak-e-Amir Shansab.**

- **0%** of KIs reported that women did **not** have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- **Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Shahrak-e-Amir Shansab.**

- **44%** of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

- **100%** of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

51% Negative perception  3% Positive perception  44% Neutral perception  2% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:  
- Unskilled labour 53%  
- Farming/agriculture 24%  
- Skilled labour 17%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

10% Negative perception  42% Positive perception  9% Neutral perception  38% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 6,098 AFN  
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 6,042 AFN

52% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: 23,830 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:
- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members 9%  
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport) 17%  
- Rent 6%  
- Food 30%  
- Shelter repairs 23%  
- COVID-19 0%  
- Other 6%  
- Healthcare 9%

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- Food 42%  
- Fuel/Electricity 35%  
- Rent 7%  
- Water 1%  
- Education costs 1%  
- Debt repayment 15%  
- Healthcare 1%

59% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASE PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)**

Helmand Province, Lashkargah District, Afghanistan

Bolan

December 2021

---

### DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 43%</td>
<td>Female (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 22%</td>
<td>Male (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:

- 16% All
- 51% Most
- 1% One
- 30% Few

- 3% of households being reportedly female-headed
- 44% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability

---

### Movement Intentions

**90%** of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.\(^5\)

Of the **10%** of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Different province: **60%**
- Same province, different district: **30%**

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:\(^3\)

- Find work or better opportunities: **80%**
- Safety/security: **10%**
- Lack of access to education: **10%**

### Refugee Returnees

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **2.6 year(s)**

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:*
  - Safety/security: 41%
  - Find work or better opportunities: 23%
  - Came to be with family: 18%

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **2 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **0.4 year(s)**

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:*

- Helmand

30% of IDP households reported that their current location was **not** their first location of displacement.\(^5\)

---

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

Community Leadership Inclusivity Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **11%** Negative perception
- **17%** Neutral perception
- **26%** Positive perception
- **47%** High positive perception

Womens Leadership

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **56%** Negative perception
- **18%** Neutral perception
- **5%** Positive perception
- **21%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **22%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **59%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- **78%** Arbab/Malik only
- **16%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **5%** Shuras for entire community
- **1%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- **26%** Elected by whole community
- **20%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **54%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **12%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **75%** High positive perception

% of households reporting that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location:
- **27%**

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:
- **In person**
  - **93%**
- **Phone/SMS reporting line**
  - **69%**
- **Community centers**
  - **39%**

67% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **69%** High positive perception

Of the 67% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **67%** Most of the time
- **22%** About half the time
- **2%** Always
- **0%** Never
- **11%** Sometimes
- **0%** Very rarely
- **0%** Few or very few times
- **0%** I do not know
- **23%** They normally do, but not very often
- **3%** Never
- **63%** Few or very few times
- **0%** Refuse to answer

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

33% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

11% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **16%** Neutral perception
- **49%** High positive perception

Of the **67%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear for personal safety</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination/harassment</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Documentation</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

#### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **3%** Negative perception
- **33%** Positive perception
- **16%** Neutral perception

#### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **20%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **56%** High positive perception

**56%** of KIs reported that there were **no** local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

#### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **14%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

- **40%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were **not** able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: **School is too far** (100%).

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

December 2021

### Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **15%** Negative perception
- **23%** Positive perception
- **31%** Neutral perception
- **32%** High positive perception

#### Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) 75%
- Damaged house 13%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) 10%

76% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

85% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

### Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **16%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **8%** Neutral perception
- **67%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine 91%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 75%
- Fees for treatment 58%

44% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

40% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

78% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

### WASH

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **51%** Negative perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **16%** Neutral perception
- **20%** High positive perception

### PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **7%** Community development
- **4%** Energy
- **18%** Infrastructure
- **7%** Shelter
- **18%** WASH
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **33%** Agriculture
- **0%** Business
- **0%** Computer training
- **0%** Cosmetics
- **18%** Handcrafts
- **67%** Healthcare
- **0%** Languages
- **0%** Religious
- **0%** Teacher training
- **0%** None
- **0%** Other

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

4% Lack of education access
3% Non-integrated IDP or re-turnee populations
14% Lack of adequate healthcare
31% Lack of livelihood opportunities
4% Unresponsive community leadership
0% None

62% Agriculture
35% Computer training
40% Handcrafts
1% Languages
33% Teacher training
65% Business
22% Cosmetics
31% Healthcare
2% Insecurity
1% Religious
0% Other

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

62% Agriculture
35% Computer training
40% Handcrafts
1% Languages
33% Teacher training
0% None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

39% Negative perception
20% Positive perception
39% Neutral perception
3% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

31% Negative perception
26% Positive perception
23% Neutral perception
21% High positive perception

For 7% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (43%)

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

55% Negative perception
8% Positive perception
7% Neutral perception
30% High positive perception

71% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

86% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

Less than 1 year
Between 1 and 3 years
Between 3 and 5 years
5 or more years

14% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

Self help groups

67% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

The family does not allow them to own a business
Lack of access to financial resources
Lack of education or skills

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

66% Negative perception 10% Positive perception
22% Neutral perception 2% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households: Small business/sales/rent 28% Farming/agriculture 21% Skilled labour 18%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.4

Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

40% Negative perception 30% Positive perception
17% Neutral perception 14% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 5,865 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 5,803 AFN

5% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:
18% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
2% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
2% Rent
9% Shelter repairs
6% Food
9% Wedding/Celebrations
12% COVID-19

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
65% Food
12% Fuel/Electricity
3% Rent
0% Water
2% Education costs
18% Healthcare
0% Debt repayment

Household Hunger Score
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

5% Severe hunger
30% Moderate hunger
65% Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

66% High
31% Medium
1% Low

100% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
0% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
89% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

95% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
40% Government financial help
60% Government material help
20% UN/NGO financial help
20% UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
0% Self-help groups
0% Associations
0% Cooperatives
33% Other

Economic Vulnerabilities

Labour Market Perceptions

Household Hunger Score

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

About IMPACT INITIATIVES
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

---

**Movement Intentions**

90% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months. Of the 10% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Different country: 100%
- Safety/security: 10%

---

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: 3.2 year(s)

- Lost legal status/forced to return: 38%
- Came to be with family: 35%
- Find work or better opportunities: 21%

---

**IDPs**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: 5.7 year(s) and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: 4 year(s)

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:
  - Daykundi: 11% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

---

**HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASED PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)**

Herat Province, Guzara District, Afghanistan

Guzara

December 2021

---

**Demographics**

Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:

- IDP: 38%
- Refugee-Returnee: 29%
- Host Community: 34%

Composition of assessed households:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>18-49</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: 6.7

---

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- 0% High vulnerability
- 52% Moderate vulnerability
- 47% Lower vulnerability

- 40% All
- 45% Most
- 0% None

- 12% Few

- 0% of households being reportedly female-headed:
- 33% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:
- 21% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:

---

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- 4% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 13% Neutral perception

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- 24% Negative perception
- 21% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

4% Negative perception 10% Positive perception
8% Neutral perception 78% High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 55% Arbab/Malik only
- 21% Shuras for smaller groups
- 25% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 97% Elected by whole community
- 2% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 1% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

10% Negative perception 12% Positive perception
9% Neutral perception 69% High positive perception

19% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- In person 99%
- Phone/SMS reporting line 65%
- Community centers 40%

78% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response. 4

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- 43% Usually they help each other
- 1% Never
- 35% They always help each other
- 0% Few or very few times
- 5% I do not know
- 0% Refuse to answer

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.4,5

78% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

11% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 0% Negative perception
- 22% Positive perception
- 4% Neutral perception
- 74% High positive perception

Of the 0% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were: 3, 4

No key informants reported protection incidents in Guzara.

- 0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement: 4, 5
- 11% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement: 4, 5

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peace and coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 0% Negative perception
- 54% Positive perception
- 17% Neutral perception
- 30% High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 24% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 60% High positive perception

**Education**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 20% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 15% Neutral perception
- 50% High positive perception

- 100% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education: 4, 5

- 0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school: 4
- 0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school: 4

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Guzara.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception
- **76%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **51%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **49%**
- Transitional shelter **1%**

53% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

99% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **80%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **9%** Community development
- **0%** Energy
- **0%** Infrastructure
- **0%** Shelter
- **82%** WASH
- **9%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **75%** Business
- **25%** Healthcare
- **25%** None

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 2%
- Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations: 0%
- Lack of adequate healthcare: 13%
- Lack of livelihood opportunities: 77%
- Unresponsive community leadership: 0%

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- Agriculture: 31%
- Computer training: 18%
- Handcrafts: 68%
- Languages: 4%
- Teacher training: 7%
- None: 1%

% of households reporting that they did not receive assistance in the last year: 9%

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- Lack of education access: 2%
- Lack of infrastructure: 0%
- Insecurity: 0%
- Lack of clean water: 8%
- Lack of shelters: 0%
- Other: 0%

9% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

No representative sample of households reported that they owned a business in Guzara.

67% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 33%
- Lack of education or skills: 33%

22% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

100% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **55%** Negative perception
- **43%** Neutral perception
- **1%** Positive perception
- **2%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households: 1

- Unskilled labour: 66%
- Small business/sales/rent: 14%
- Skilled labour: 5%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.1

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **47%** Negative perception
- **21%** Neutral perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **14%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **4,855 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **4,837 AFN**

- **49%** of households reported that they do not have debt.

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- **12%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **2%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **0%** Rent
- **6%** Shelter repairs
- **14%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **23%** Healthcare
- **42%** Food
- **0%** COVID-19
- **0%** Other

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **68%** Food
- **9%** Fuel/Electricity
- **12%** Rent
- **2%** Water
- **9%** Education costs
- **1%** Healthcare
- **1%** Debt repayment

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **0%** Severe hunger
- **12%** Moderate hunger
- **88%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **18%** High
- **28%** Medium
- **52%** Low

- **56%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

- **33%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

- **89%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
### Demographics

**Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:**
- IDP: 45%
- Refugee Returnee: 37%
- Host Community: 19%

**Composition of assessed households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female (50%)</th>
<th>Male (50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average household size:** 8.1

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **3%** Moderate high vulnerability
- **18%** Lower vulnerability

**% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:**
- **30%** All
- **13%** One
- **3%** Most
- **1%** None

**% of households being reportedly female-headed:** 0%

**% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:** 34%

**% of households reporting one or more members have a disability:** 26%

### Movement Intentions

97% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

Of the 3% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
- Same province, different district: 67%
- Different province: 33%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
- Find work or better opportunities: 67%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 33%

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **17%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception

### Refugee Returnees

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **10.4 year(s)**

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Lost legal status/forced to return: 49%
  - Safety/security: 27%
  - Find work or better opportunities: 19%

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **4.8 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **3.1 year(s)**

- **29%** of IDP households were living prior to current PARR location
- **Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:** Maidan Wardak

- **29%** of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

### Womens Leadership

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **23%** Neutral perception
- **44%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- 30% Arbab/Malik only
- 35% Shuras for smaller groups
- 35% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- 94% Elected by whole community
- 1% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 5% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **81%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.
  - Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:
    - **74%** Households
    - **47%** Landowners
    - **37%** Men

  Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:
  - **68%** Land or shelter
  - **37%** Money
  - **11%** Other

  Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:
  - **84%** Community leadership
  - **37%** Households themselves
  - **32%** Community leadership sub-groups

  Of the **0%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

  - **0%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.
  - **22%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

  **No key informants reported protection incidents in Qala-e-Abdul-Ali.**

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **2%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **95%** High positive perception

- **2%** Negative perception
- **24%** Positive perception
- **60%** Neutral perception
- **1%** High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **4%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **74%** High positive perception

- **4%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **74%** High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **85%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **1%** High positive perception

- **33%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

- **67%** of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.
  - Of those, the main reported reason that boys could not attend was:
    - **7%** Low quality of education
    - **67%** cannot afford to pay for school related costs

- **67%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.
  - Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was:
    - **7%** Low quality of education

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 0% Negative perception
- 40% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 51% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) 92%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) 7%
- Damaged house 1%

15% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

98% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

WASH

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 59% Negative perception
- 13% Positive perception
- 8% Neutral perception
- 20% High positive perception

Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 97% Negative perception
- 0% Positive perception
- 3% Neutral perception
- 0% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine 100%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 60%
- Fees for treatment 27%

PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- 0% Community development
- 0% Energy
- 19% Infrastructure
- 0% Shelter
- 30% WASH
- 0% Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- 13% Agriculture
- 0% Computer training
- 62% Handcrafts
- 0% Languages
- 0% Teacher training
- 0% Other

67% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

44% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

22% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from.

67% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

78% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

33% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education access</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate healthcare</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresponsive community leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following assistance in this location in the last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 3 years</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 5 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Qala-e-Abdul-Ali.

89% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% of KIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education or skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to financial resources</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge in registering a business</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

11% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- 35% Negative perception
- 1% Positive perception
- 63% Neutral perception
- 1% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- Unskilled labour: 54%
- Borrowing/loans/humanitarian assistance: 12%
- Skilled labour: 11%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.2

Household Hunger Score
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- 1% Severe hunger
- 55% Moderate hunger
- 45% Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- 83% High
- 16% Medium
- 0% Low

- 100% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- 44% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- 100% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- 21% Negative perception
- 24% Positive perception
- 27% Neutral perception
- 29% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 6,015 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 9,830 AFN

- 9% of households reported that they do not have debt.
- Average household debt: 46,201 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:
- 0% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- 4% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- 3% Rent
- 66% Food
- 4% Shelter repairs
- 0% COVID-19
- 7% Wedding/Celebrations
- 1% Other
- 14% Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- 63% Food
- 15% Fuel/Electricity
- 4% Rent
- 2% Water
- 3% Education costs
- 13% Healthcare
- 0% Debt repayment

- 85% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- 7% Government financial help
- 0% Government material help
- 36% UN/NGO financial help
- 71% UN/NGO material help

- % of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
  - 0% Self-help groups
  - 0% Associations
  - 33% Cooperatives
  - 0% Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 24%</td>
<td>Female (44%) Male (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 21%</td>
<td>3% 65+ 1% 4% 50-64 3% 10% 18-49 13% 7% 16-17 9% 5% 5-15 12% 10% 1-4 11% 5% &lt;1 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: 10.3

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- High vulnerability: 2%
- Moderate high vulnerability: 40%
- Moderate vulnerability: 55%
- Lower vulnerability: 4%

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:

- All: 1%
- Most: 11%
- None: 45%
- Few: 42%

% of households being reportedly female-headed: 0%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: 37%

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: 27%

**Movement Intentions**

- 95% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.5

Of the 5% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Same province, different district: 60%
- Different province: 40%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- Find work or better opportunities: 60%
- Lack of housing/shelter: 40%

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: *0.8 year(s)*

- Came to be with family: 48%
- Safety/security: 24%
- Find work or better opportunities: 14%

**IDPs**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: *2.6 year(s)* and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: *0.8 year(s)*

- Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location: *Kandahar*
- 33% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- Negative perception: 43%
- Positive perception: 12%
- Neutral perception: 41%
- High positive perception: 5%

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- Negative perception: 91%
- Positive perception: 0%
- Neutral perception: 4%
- High positive perception: 5%

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **47%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **20%** Neutral perception
- **18%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **62%** Arbab/Malik only
- **18%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **16%** Shuras for entire community
- **4%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **41%** Elected by whole community
- **13%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **46%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **46%** Negative perception
- **18%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **28%** High positive perception

% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

- **38%**

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- **62%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **62%** In person
- **36%** Community centers

**100%** of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

**COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND STABILITY**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **42%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **12%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **49%** Negative perception
- **13%** Positive perception
- **25%** Neutral perception
- **14%** High positive perception

Of the **78%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **0%** Most of the time
- **11%** Sometimes
- **78%** About half the time
- **0%** Very rarely
- **11%** Always
- **0%** Never

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **10%** Usually they help each other
- **2%** Never
- **3%** They always help each other
- **52%** Few or very few times
- **4%** I do not know
- **30%** They normally do, but not very often

**43%** of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

**100%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

**22%** of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 43% Negative perception
- 19% Positive perception
- 26% Neutral perception
- 13% High positive perception

Of the 56% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Debt Related Concerns: 80%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: 60%
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: 60%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

0% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 15% Negative perception
- 30% Positive perception
- 39% Neutral perception
- 17% High positive perception

Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 28% Negative perception
- 33% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 40% High positive perception

Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 53% Negative perception
- 14% Positive perception
- 11% Neutral perception
- 23% High positive perception

78% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

Key informants reported that boys of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Panjwai Center.

100% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was cultural reasons (100%).

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.
BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS

Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- 20% Negative perception
- 44% Positive perception
- 22% Neutral perception
- 15% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): 46%
- Damaged house: 38%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 10%

70% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

- 87% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

WASH

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- 18% Negative perception
- 20% Positive perception
- 5% Neutral perception
- 57% High positive perception

Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- 60% Negative perception
- 5% Positive perception
- 12% Neutral perception
- 23% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine: 85%
- Travel to healthcare facilities: 77%
- Fees for treatment: 74%

- 22% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

- 0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

- 44% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- 21% Community development
- 11% Education
- 16% Energy
- 11% Infrastructure
- 37% Shelter
- 0% WASH

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- 85% Agriculture
- 0% Computer training
- 46% Handcrafts
- 0% Languages
- 54% Teacher training
- 0% Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- **3%** Lack of education access
- **0%** Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- **12%** Lack of adequate healthcare
- **46%** Lack of livelihood opportunities
- **3%** Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- **70%** Agriculture
- **6%** Computer training
- **27%** Handcrafts
- **4%** Languages
- **39%** Teacher training
- **2%** None

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following assistance in the last year:

- **72%** of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.\(^3\)

69% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.\(^5\)

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: **54%**
- Between 1 and 3 years: **46%**
- Between 3 and 5 years: **0%**
- 5 or more years: **0%**

11% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Self help groups: **100%**
- Village-based savings and lending: **100%**

100% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows: \(^3,4\)

- Lack of access to financial resources: **89%**
- Lack of education or skills: **78%**
- Women are punished for owning businesses: **44%**

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.\(^4\)

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

\(^4\) Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

\(^5\) Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
### Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Farming/agriculture: 38%
- Livestock production: 21%
- Small business/sales/rent: 19%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

### Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly income reported by households: **4,429 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **3,431 AFN**

#### Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- Severe hunger: 7%
- Moderate hunger: 44%
- Little hunger: 50%

#### Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- High: 90%
- Medium: 9%
- Low: 1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Household Debt</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter repairs</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding/Celebrations</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- Food: 45%
- Fuel/Electricity: 6%
- Rent: 15%
- Education costs: 1%
- Debt repayment: 32%
- Self-help groups: 0%
- Associations: 0%
- Cooperatives: 33%

### About IMPACT Initiatives

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Female (48%) Male (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 65+ 1% 50-64 3% 18-49 3% 5-15 8% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **8.3**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **52%** Moderate vulnerability
- **28%** Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:<br>
- **17%** All<br>- **66%** Most<br>- **15%** Few

% of households being reportedly female-headed: **0%**

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: **18%**

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: **12%**

### Movement Intentions

92% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

Of the 8% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- **Different province** 63%
- **Same province, different district** 25%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- **Safety/security** 50%
- **Lack of housing/shelter** 38%
- **Find work or better opportunities** 13%

### Refugee Returnees

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **1.6 year(s)**

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:

- **Lost legal status/forced to return** 52%
- **Find work or better opportunities** 39%
- **Came to be with family** 9%

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **5.6 year(s)** and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **3.3 year(s)**

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:

- **Kapisa** 10% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **96%** High positive perception

### Womens Leadership

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **89%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Neutral</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 7% of households reporting on their community representatives: Arbab/Malik only
- 4% Shuras for smaller groups
- 89% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

99% Elected by whole community
0% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
1% Appointed by other leaders
0% Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2% Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Neutral</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% Positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 0% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- In person: 78%
- Phone/SMS reporting line: 74%
- UN/NGO staff: 13%

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21% Negative</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Neutral</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% Positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17% Negative</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% Neutral</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Positive</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 100% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- 11% Most of the time
- 56% About half the time
- 0% Always

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- 27% Usually they help each other
- 12% They always help each other
- 1% I do not know
- 9% They normally do, but not very often

- 0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

- 67% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

- 22% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 35% Negative perception
- 13% Positive perception
- 5% Neutral perception
- 47% High positive perception

Of the 33% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Other (67%)
- Fear for personal safety (33%)
- Government restrictions related to COVID-19 (33%)

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

33% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 0% Negative perception
- 51% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception
- 42% High positive perception

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services:

- 3% Negative perception
- 2% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception
- 95% High positive perception

31% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Landowners 75%
- Men 74%
- Households 59%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership 87%
- Police 32%
- Religious leader 9%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Land or shelter 99%
- Marriage/relationships 62%
- Money 61%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Aroki Sofla.
Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (fired bricks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4% Negative perception 51% Positive perception 2% Neutral perception 43% High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

99% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82% Negative perception 6% Neutral perception 9% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine 96%
- Fees for treatment 17%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 1%

WASH

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- Community development: 0%
- Energy: 0%
- Infrastructure: 31%
- Shelter: 0%
- WASH: 0%
- Other: 0%

- Education: 0%
- Health: 0%
- Livelihoods: 31%
- Special assistance: 31%
- Don’t know: 2%
- Nothing: 8%

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- Agriculture: 0%
- Business: 0%
- Computer training: 0%
- Cosmetics: 0%
- Handcrafts: 0%
- Healthcare: 0%
- Languages: 25%
- Religious: 25%
- Teacher training: 25%
- None: 0%
- Other: 25%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education access</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate healthcare</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresponsive community leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women’s Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

78% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 100%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 100%
- The family does not allow them to own a business: 43%

78% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

22% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly income reported by households: 4,750 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 7,724 AFN

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- Severe hunger: 1%
- Moderate hunger: 27%
- Little hunger: 72%

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- High: 76%
- Medium: 16%
- Low: 7%

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT Initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **29%** Moderate vulnerability
- **70%** Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera: 8% All, 6% One, 62% Most, 0% None

% of households being reportedly female-headed: 0%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability: 11%

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability: 4%

---

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **2%** Neutral perception
- **90%** High positive perception

---

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **59%** Negative perception
- **15%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **17%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **95%** High positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **50%** Arbab/Malik only
- **0%** Shuras for only smaller groups
- **50%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **52%** Elected by whole community
- **48%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **0%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **93%** High positive perception

3% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.⁵

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:³⁶

- **78%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **68%** Shura meetings
- **66%** In person

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.⁴

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **31%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

- **39%** Usually they help each other
- **28%** They always help each other
- **0%** I do not know
- **0%** They normally do, but not very often

Of the 100% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:⁴

- **0%** Most of the time
- **0%** Sometimes
- **0%** About half the time
- **100%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **0%** Never

100% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.⁴⁵

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.⁴⁵

0% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.⁴⁵

---

³ The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

⁴ Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

⁵ Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

⁶ Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **42%** Positive perception
- **17%** Neutral perception

Of the **89%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **Fear for personal safety**
  - **100%**
- **Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community**
  - **88%**
- **Debt Related Concerns**
  - **75%**

**13%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Households**
  - **82%**
- **Business owners**
  - **76%**
- **Men**
  - **56%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **Community leadership**
  - **97%**
- **Religious leader**
  - **90%**
- **Households themselves**
  - **58%**

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **Marriage/relationships**
  - **94%**
- **Business disagreements**
  - **72%**
- **Money**
  - **64%**

**22%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**100%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**13%** of households reported that most boys of school age were **not** able to attend primary school.

**0%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were **not** able to attend primary school.

**0%** of KIs reported that there were **no** local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

**0%** of KIs reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Qalamwal Mi.

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception

**Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Qalamwal Mi.**
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**
  - Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **100%**

- **Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**
  - Written agreement **98%**
  - Verbal agreement **2%**

- **94%** of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/ agriculture.

- **100%** of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **89%** High positive perception

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **29%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **50%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **0%** Community development
- **0%** Energy
- **0%** Infrastructure
- **0%** Shelter
- **0%** WASH
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **0%** Agriculture
- **0%** Computer training
- **0%** Handcrafts
- **0%** Languages
- **0%** Teacher training
- **0%** Other

- **0%** of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.
- **78%** of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.
- **0%** of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.
- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.
- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.
- **0%** of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **29%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **50%** High positive perception

- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.
- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.
- **0%** of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **29%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception
- **50%** High positive perception

- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.
- **0%** of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.
- **0%** of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 2% Lack of education access
- 2% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 22% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 60% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 3% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:6

- 48% Agriculture
- 48% Computer training
- 54% Handcrafts
- 1% Languages
- 8% Teacher training
- 0% None

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 2% Lack of education access
- 0% Lack of infrastructure
- 2% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 9% Insecurity
- 2% Lack of clean water
- 0% Lack of shelters
- 0% Other

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.5

- 74% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.3

- 72% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.5

- 0% of business owners reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:
  - Less than 1 year: 0%
  - Between 1 and 3 years: 84%
  - Between 3 and 5 years: 16%
  - 5 or more years: 0%

- 0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- 11% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:3,4

  - Lack of access to financial resources: 33%
  - Lack of ability to travel alone: 33%
  - The family does not allow them to own a business: 33%

- 100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.4

- 0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.4

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- 87% Negative perception
- 2% Positive perception
- 11% Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:1
- Small business/sales/rent: 28%
- Formal employment: private/public sector: 27%
- Farming/agriculture: 17%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.5

Household Hunger Score
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- 0% Severe hunger
- 0% Moderate hunger
- 100% Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index
As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- 24% High
- 75% Medium
- 0% Low

Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- 41% Negative perception
- 19% Positive perception
- 13% Neutral perception
- 27% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 12,690 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 11,815 AFN

Average household debt: 15,609 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:
- 2% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- 2% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- 7% Rent
- 11% Food
- 33% Shelter repairs
- 0% COVID-19
- 9% Wedding/Celebrations
- 0% Other
- 37% Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- 37% Food
- 15% Fuel/Electricity
- 12% Rent
- 0% Water
- 10% Education costs
- 22% Healthcare
- 4% Debt repayment

80% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.5

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- 0% Government financial help
- 0% Government material help
- 0% UN/NGO financial help
- 0% UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
- 0% Self-help groups
- 0% Associations
- 0% Cooperatives
- 33% Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

About IMPACT INITIATIVES
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
**Movement Intentions**

97% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.\(^5\)

Of the 3% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- Same province, different district: 67%
- Different province: 33%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:°

- Find work or better opportunities: 100%
- None: 0%
- Safety/security: 43%
- Most: 22%
- Few: 8%
- Most: 18%
- Few: 2%
- Negative perception: 4%
- Neutral perception: 7%
- Positive perception: 9%
- High positive perception: 15%

The average time reported since IDP households were first displaced:°

- 5 years: 5%
- 3 years: 3%
- 1 year: 1%
- 6 months: 2%
- 3 months: 4%
- 2 months: 2%
- 1 month: 8%
- 0 months: 28%
- 4 months: 13%
- 2 months: 8%
- 1 month: 4%
- 6 months: 4%
- 3 months: 16%
- 2 months: 5%
- 1 month: 13%
- 6 months: 8%
- 3 months: 4%

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:°

- 5 years: 11.8 years
- 3 years: 1.1 years
- 1 year: 0.8 years
- 6 months: 0.4 years
- 3 months: 0.2 years
- 1 month: 0.1 years
- 6 months: 0.1 years
- 3 months: 0.1 years
- 1 month: 0.1 years

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in the location:°

- 11.8 years

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:°

- Lost legal status/forced to return: 49%
- Safety/security: 43%
- Find work or better opportunities: 8%
- None: 0%
- Most: 22%
- Few: 8%
- Negative perception: 4%
- Neutral perception: 7%
- Positive perception: 9%
- High positive perception: 15%

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:°

- 5 years: 5%
- 3 years: 3%
- 1 year: 1%
- 6 months: 2%
- 3 months: 4%
- 2 months: 2%
- 1 month: 8%
- 6 months: 4%
- 3 months: 13%
- 2 months: 8%
- 1 month: 4%
- 6 months: 4%
- 3 months: 16%
- 2 months: 5%
- 1 month: 13%
- 6 months: 8%
- 3 months: 4%

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:°

- Kunar: 15%

% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement:°

- 15%
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **17%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **23%** Neutral perception
- **56%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- **31%** Arbab/Malik only
- **0%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **69%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- **91%** Elected by whole community
- **2%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **23%** Negative perception
- **9%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception
- **64%** High positive perception

2% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:
- **Phone/SMS reporting line** 100%
- **In person** 100%
- **Shura meetings** 50%

89% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **27%** Negative perception
- **33%** Positive perception
- **17%** Neutral perception
- **24%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **36%** Negative perception
- **47%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **8%** High positive perception

Of the **33%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **22%** Most of the time
- **56%** Sometimes
- **0%** About half the time
- **11%** Very rarely
- **11%** Always
- **0%** Never

89% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey). Respondents could select up to three options.
6. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of public service and satisfaction on a daily basis:

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **Fear for personal safety:** 100% Positive perception
- **Debt Related Concerns:** 83% High positive perception
- **Lack of Documentation:** 17% Neutral perception

### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **Negative perception:** 0%
- **Positive perception:** 9%
- **High positive perception:** 91%

### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **Negative perception:** 8%
- **Positive perception:** 12%
- **High positive perception:** 61%

### Key Informants-reported access to education

- **Boys:** Able to attend primary school
- **Girls:** Able to attend primary school

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
5. Respondents could select up to three options.
6. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **9%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **16%** Neutral perception
- **67%** High positive perception

**Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**

- Permanent shelter (mud) **53%**
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks) **43%**
- Damaged house **3%**

**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**

- Written agreement **82%**
- Verbal agreement **9%**
- Prefer not to answer **9%**

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **20%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **19%** Neutral perception
- **55%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine **92%**
- Fees for treatment **69%**
- Travel to healthcare facilities **38%**

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **45%** Negative perception
- **13%** Positive perception
- **17%** Neutral perception
- **26%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **63%** Community development
- **13%** Energy
- **0%** Infrastructure
- **0%** Shelter
- **3%** WASH
- **0%** Other

- **50%** Education
- **13%** Health
- **0%** Livelihoods
- **93%** Special assistance
- **0%** Don’t know
- **0%** Nothing

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- Agriculture **0%**
- Computer training **0%**
- Handcrafts **0%**
- Languages **0%**
- Teacher training **67%**
- Other **0%**

- Business **33%**
- Cosmetics **0%**
- Healthcare **33%**
- Religious **0%**
- None **0%**

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 3% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 0% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 94% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

3% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.¹³

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:⁵

- 27% Agriculture
- 18% Computer training
- 68% Handcrafts
- 27% Teacher training
- 78% Business
- 0% Cosmetics
- 38% Healthcare
- 0% Religious
- 0% Other

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

- 31% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.¹³

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 20%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 49%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 28%
- 5 or more years: 3%

80% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.⁵

46% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Self help groups: 94%
- Village-based savings and lending: 94%
- Bank/loans: 44%

0% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to own a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows: ¹³

Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Asadabad.

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.⁴

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.⁴

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **86%** Negative perception
- **0%** Positive perception
- **14%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- Small business/sales/rent: **35%**
- Formal employment: private/public sector: **31%**
- Skilled labour: **25%**

Average number of bread winners per household: **1.4**

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **4%** Severe hunger
- **36%** Moderate hunger
- **60%** Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **93%** High
- **7%** Medium
- **0%** Low

- **100%** of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.
- **11%** of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.
- **89%** of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

---

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **59%** Negative perception
- **27%** Positive perception
- **11%** Neutral perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **5,550 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **10,325 AFN**

Average household debt: **52,341 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to have debt to take on debt:

- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: **0%**
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): **0%**
- Rent: **43%**
- Food: **17%**
- Shelter repairs: **0%**
- COVID-19: **12%**
- Other: **6%**
- Healthcare: **23%**

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- **53%** Food
- **11%** Fuel/Electricity
- **6%** Rent
- **0%** Water
- **3%** Education costs
- **27%** Healthcare
- **0%** Debt repayment

- **56%** of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- **3%** Government financial help
- **26%** Government material help
- **90%** UN/NGO financial help
- **84%** UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- **0%** Self-help groups
- **0%** Associations
- **33%** Cooperatives

---

3. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
4. Respondents could select up to three options.
The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **82%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **31%** Arbab/Malik only
- **7%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **61%** Shuras for entire community
- **1%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **90%** Elected by whole community
- **3%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **7%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **77%** High positive perception

12% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- **93%** In person
- **68%** Phone/SMS reporting line
- **66%** Shura meetings

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

---

**COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND STABILITY**

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **30%** Positive perception
- **66%** High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **11%** Neutral perception
- **40%** Positive perception
- **42%** High positive perception

Of the **78%** of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **0%** Most of the time
- **33%** About half the time
- **67%** Sometimes
- **0%** Very rarely

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

**Community Relations and Stability Index**

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **8%** Usually they help each other
- **20%** Never
- **1%** They always help each other
- **52%** Few or very few times
- **1%** I do not know
- **0%** Refuse to answer

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

100% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

11% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.
### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **Fear for personal safety:** 60%
- **None:** 20%
- **Discrimination/harassment from others groups:** 20%

Of the 56% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **Fear for personal safety:** 60%
- **None:** 20%
- **Discrimination/harassment from others groups:** 20%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

0% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

56% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Gangs:** 64%
- **Youth:** 64%
- **Landowners:** 50%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **Community leadership:** 98%
- **Religious leader:** 89%
- **Police:** 50%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **Money:** 77%
- **Crime/theft:** 61%
- **Land or shelter:** 61%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **Community leadership:** 98%
- **Religious leader:** 89%
- **Police:** 50%

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

#### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **0%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **76%** High positive perception

#### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **90%** High positive perception

#### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **78%** High positive perception

### 33% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Mihterlam.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

5. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **10%** Neutral perception
- **74%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (fired bricks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

96% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **4%** Negative perception
- **16%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **68%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine | 100%
- Fees for treatment | 87%
- Travel to healthcare facilities | 56%

0% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

33% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

33% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **17%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **60%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

67% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

0% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.

96% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

4,5 Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

4,5 Respondents could select up to three options.

4,5 Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 1% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 5% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 78% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 46% Agriculture
- 12% Computer training
- 91% Handcrafts
- 31% Teacher training
- 57% Business
- 0% Cosmetics
- 55% Healthcare
- 0% Religious
- 0% Other
- 0% None

4% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

86% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days. 5

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 0%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 43%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 29%
- 5 or more years: 29%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Mihterlam.

11% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows: 3,4

Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Mihterlam.

33% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.4

67% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.4

Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived insecurity:

- 1% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 5% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 78% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 19% Negative perception
- 41% Positive perception
- 40% Neutral perception
- 0% High positive perception

Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 40% Negative perception
- 22% Positive perception
- 34% Neutral perception
- 4% High positive perception

Women's Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

- 6% Negative perception
- 9% Positive perception
- 21% Neutral perception
- 64% High positive perception

For 7% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (71%)

80% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days. 5

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Mihterlam.

11% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows: 3,4

Key informants reported that women had the ability to own a business and therefore did not face barriers in Mihterlam.

33% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.4

67% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.4
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **51%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **47%** Neutral perception
- **0%** High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Unskilled labour: 36%
- Skilled labour: 18%
- Small business/sales/rent: 16%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **44%** Negative perception
- **44%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **5%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **10,210 AFN**

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **10,927 AFN**

9% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Average household debt: **43,407 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- 3% Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- 3% Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- 0% Rent
- 33% Food
- 14% Shelter repairs
- 1% COVID-19
- 20% Wedding/Celebrations
- 0% Other
- 25% Healthcare

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

- 43% Food
- 20% Fuel/Electricity
- 1% Rent
- 1% Water
- 3% Debt repayment
- 31% Healthcare

72% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- 73% Government financial help
- 67% Government material help
- 53% UN/NGO financial help
- 40% UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- 0% Self-help groups
- 0% Associations
- 0% Cooperatives
- 33% Other

1% Severe hunger

63% Moderate hunger

36% Little hunger

95% High

5% Medium

0% Low

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
### DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Proportion of Households Surveyed</th>
<th>Composition of Assessed Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2% 65+ 3% 50-64 17% 18-49 4% 17% 4% 18-49 6% 1-4 2% 2% 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Returnee</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4% 16-17 4% 16-17 17% 5-15 15% 6% 1-4 6% 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2% &lt;1 2% &lt;1 2% &lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: **11**

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities:

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **34%** Moderate vulnerability
- **65%** Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera:

- **55%** All
- **32%** Most
- **2%** None

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:

- **11%**
- **6%**

% of households being reportedly female-headed:

- **0%**

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:

- **11%**

### MOVEMENT INTENTIONS

96% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

Of the **4%** of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:

- **Different country:** 75%
- **Same province, different district:** 25%

Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:

- **Find work or better opportunities:** 100%

### REFUGEE RETURNEES

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location:* 14.9 year(s)

% of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:

- **Find work or better opportunities:** 33%
- **Safety/security:** 31%
- **Lost legal status/forced to return:** 22%

### IDPs

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:* 8.2 year(s) and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location:* 5.8 year(s)

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:

- **Nangarhar**

30% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.*

### COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **81%** High positive perception

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **15%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **51%** High positive perception

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- 5% Negative perception
- 7% Positive perception
- 6% Neutral perception
- 82% High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 54% Arbab/Malik only
- 2% Shuras for smaller groups
- 44% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 97% Elected by whole community
- 0% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 3% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

**Community Leadership Accountability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- 1% Negative perception
- 9% Positive perception
- 2% Neutral perception
- 88% High positive perception

2% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location. 5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- In person: 100%
- Phone/SMS reporting line: 56%
- AWAAZ: 22%

86% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response. 4

**Community Relations and Stability**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- 0% Negative perception
- 9% Positive perception
- 1% Neutral perception
- 90% High positive perception

**Community Relations**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- 3% Negative perception
- 23% Positive perception
- 14% Neutral perception
- 60% High positive perception

Of the 89% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- 44% Most of the time
- 22% About half the time
- 23% Always
- 0% Sometimes
- 2% Very rarely
- 11% Never

13% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

89% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

0% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

---

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- 1% Negative perception
- 6% Positive perception
- 3% Neutral perception

Of the 22% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: 100%
- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: 50%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: 50%

59% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Landowners: 93%
- Business owners: 90%
- Households: 24%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: 90%
- Religious leader: 24%
- Households themselves: 22%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Land or shelter: 100%
- Money: 44%
- Marriage/relationships: 39%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

0% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

---

### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access

---

#### Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- 1% Negative perception
- 13% Positive perception
- 2% Neutral perception

#### Leadership of Service Provision

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- 14% Negative perception
- 24% Positive perception
- 0% Neutral perception

---

### Education

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- 4% Negative perception
- 3% Positive perception
- 7% Neutral perception

11% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

0% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school.

0% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Key informants reported that boys and girls of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Kama.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**SHELTER AND LAND TENURE**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing.

- **6%** Negative perception
- **31%** Positive perception
- **5%** Neutral perception
- **58%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud): 79%
- Makeshift shelter: 11%
- Permanent shelter (fired bricks): 9%

67% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception
- **88%** High positive perception

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **14%** Community development
- **0%** Energy
- **22%** Infrastructure
- **2%** Shelter
- **16%** WASH
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **38%** Agriculture
- **6%** Business
- **0%** Computer training
- **25%** Health
- **13%** Languages
- **0%** Religious
- **44%** Handcrafts
- **0%** None
- **44%** Teacher training
- **0%** Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 1% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 99% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 69% Agriculture
- 25% Computer training
- 26% Handcrafts
- 35% Teacher training
- 64% Business
- 13% Healthcare
- 1% Cosmetics
- 0% Religious
- 0% Other
- 0% None

29% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 69% Agriculture
- 25% Computer training
- 26% Handcrafts
- 35% Teacher training
- 64% Business
- 13% Healthcare
- 1% Cosmetics
- 0% Religious
- 0% Other
- 0% None

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- 4% Negative perception
- 22% Positive perception
- 74% Neutral perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

- 77% Negative perception
- 9% Positive perception
- 9% Neutral perception

Women’s Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook.

- 9% Negative perception
- 16% Positive perception
- 11% Neutral perception

- 51% households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

- 91% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: 18%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 9%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 18%
- 5 or more years: 55%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Kama.

89% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- Lack of access to financial resources: 75%
- Lack of education or skills: 63%
- Lack of ability to travel alone: 63%

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

43%  Negative perception  0%  Positive perception  
57%  Neutral perception  0%  High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Farming/agriculture 40%
- Unskilled labour 27%
- Formal private/public sector 12%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.6

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

35%  Negative perception  40%  Positive perception  
20%  Neutral perception  5%  High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 9,490 AFN
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 13,209 AFN

15%  of households reported that they do not have debt.
Average household debt: 32,388 AFN

Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport) 65%
Food 1%
COVID-19 1%
Other 0%
Healthcare 17%

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:

Food 75%
Fuel/Electricity 5%
Rent 2%
Water 2%
Education costs 16%
Healthcare 0%
Debt repayment 0%

95%  of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

0%  Government financial help  40%  Government material help  
40%  UN/NGO financial help  60%  UN/NGO material help

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- Self-help groups 25%
- Associations 25%
- Cooperatives 75%
- Other 33%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

0%  Severe hunger  20%  Moderate hunger  80%  Little hunger

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

68%  High  25%  Medium  4%  Low

78%  of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

11%  of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

56%  of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

**HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASE PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)**

Nangarhar Province, Surkhrod District, Afghanistan

**December 2021**

### DEMOGRAPHICS

**Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composition of assessed households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>50-64</th>
<th>18-49</th>
<th>5-15</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average household size:** 11.2

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- **0%** High vulnerability
- **29%** Moderate vulnerability
- **70%** Lower vulnerability

**% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera**

- 65% All
- 26% Most
- 0% None
- 8% Few

**% of households being reportedly female-headed:**

- 0%

**% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:**

- 52%

**Movement Intentions**

92% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.

- Of the 8% of households reporting the intention to move in the next 12 months, the two most common movement intention locations were:
  - **Different country** 38%
  - **Same province, different district** 38%

- Of those households reporting the intention to move, the proportion of households by their reported main reason to move:
  - Find work or better opportunities 63%
  - Lack of housing/shelter 38%
  - Lack of access to education 0%

**Refugee Returnees**

Average reported time that refugee returnee households have been in this location: **7.7 year(s)**

- % of refugee returnee households by main reason that they chose to return:
  - Lost legal status/forced to return 46%
  - Safety/security 23%
  - Came to be with family 11%

- Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced: **5.7 year(s)**

- Average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location: **3.9 year(s)**

**IDPs**

- % of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:
  - 25%

**Community Leadership Inclusivity**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability, promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **90%** High positive perception

**Womens Leadership**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- **3%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **92%** High positive perception

---

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45% of households reported that they were **not** aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.  

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:
- Phone/SMS reporting line: 96%
- In person: 91%
- Community centers: 70%

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting on their community representatives:
- Arbab/Malik only: 41%
- Shuras for smaller groups: 8%
- Shuras for entire community: 51%
- No one: 0%
- Other: 0%

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:
- Elected by whole community: 97%
- Elected only by community that belongs to the same group: 2%
- Appointed by other leaders: 1%
- Other: 0%

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 89% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:
- Most of the time: 0%
- Sometimes: 33%
- Very rarely: 67%
- About half the time: 0%
- Always: 0%
- Never: 0%

### Community Relations and Stability Index

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helper Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually help each other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They always help each other</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They normally do, but not very often</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never help</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.

89% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.

0% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were **not** handled in a fair and equitable way.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**Safety, Security, and Stability**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception

Of the **11%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- **100%** Discrimination/harassment from others groups
- **100%** Fear for personal safety

- **85%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **93%** Landowners
- **80%** Households
- **60%** Youth

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **73%** Community leadership
- **73%** Households themselves
- **60%** Community leadership sub-groups

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **93%** Land or shelter
- **60%** Marriage/relationships
- **40%** Money

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- **93%** Landowners
- **80%** Households
- **60%** Youth

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- **93%** Land or shelter
- **60%** Marriage/relationships
- **40%** Money

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- **73%** Community leadership
- **73%** Households themselves
- **60%** Community leadership sub-groups

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception

- **96%** High positive perception

- **0%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **0%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

- **96%** High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **7%** Negative perception
- **12%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception

- **81%** High positive perception

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
### Shelter and Land Tenure

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception
- **87%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (fired bricks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

95% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

### Healthcare

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception
- **94%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees for treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to healthcare facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.4,5

### WASH

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **0%** Positive perception
- **3%** Neutral perception
- **96%** High positive perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4,5

44% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4,5

### PARR Programme Support Activity Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8% Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% WASH7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29% Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Computer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% Handcrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

11% Lack of education access
0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
3% Lack of adequate healthcare
82% Lack of livelihood opportunities
0% Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

18% Agriculture
71% Business
33% Computer training
0% Cosmetics
97% Handcrafts
23% Healthcare
17% Languages
4% Religious
13% Teacher training
0% Other
0% None
0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, everyday expenditures and economic variables:

4% Negative perception
12% Positive perception
83% Neutral perception
1% High positive perception

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook.

41% Negative perception
39% Positive perception
17% Neutral perception
4% High positive perception

For 52% of households that reported having their own business, the most common sector was: Wholesale, retail trade, hotels, restaurants (56%)

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook.

0% Negative perception
2% Positive perception
2% Neutral perception
96% High positive perception

22% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

Less than 1 year 17%
Between 1 and 3 years 39%
Between 3 and 5 years 23%
5 or more years 21%

0% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

No representative sample of households reported that there were support networks or institutions to support businesses in Surkhrod.

22% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

Lack of access to financial resources 100%
The family does not allow them to own a business 100%
Lack of education or skills 50%

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

67% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the labour market.

- **52%** Negative perception
- **6%** Positive perception
- **43%** Neutral perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Skilled labour: 28%
- Small business/sales/rent: 26%
- Unskilled labour: 22%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **92%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **4%** Neutral perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 13,356 AFN

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 11,852 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: 3%
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): 0%
- Rent: 17%
- Shelter repairs: 0%
- COVID-19: 0%
- Other: 1%
- Healthcare: 52%

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- **1%** Severe hunger
- **52%** Moderate hunger
- **48%** Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- **65%** High
- **30%** Medium
- **2%** Low

78% of KIs reported that people in the location who wanted jobs could not find them.

0% of KIs reported that households did not have the sufficient skills to get jobs if they wanted them.

100% of KIs reported that no collectives organized around business ownership existed in that area.

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

About IMPACT INITIATIVES

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- 4% Negative perception
- 11% Neutral perception
- 85% Positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- 0% Arbab/Malik only
- 31% Shuras for smaller groups
- 69% Shuras for entire community
- 0% No one
- 0% Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- 100% Elected by whole community
- 0% Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- 0% Appointed by other leaders
- 0% Other

Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- 9% Negative perception
- 15% Neutral perception
- 76% Positive perception

27% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- In person 100%
- Phone/SMS reporting line 96%
- Community centers 24%

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- 0% Negative perception
- 9% Neutral perception
- 91% Positive perception

Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- 1% Negative perception
- 2% Neutral perception
- 97% Positive perception

Of the 89% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:4

- 22% Most of the time
- 0% About half the time
- 0% Always

- 67% Sometimes
- 11% Very rarely
- 0% Never

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
**BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS**

**December 2021**

### Safety, Security, and Stability

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

13% Negative perception  
25% Positive perception  
17% Neutral perception  
45% High positive perception

Of the 100% of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: 89%
- Fear for personal safety: 89%
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: 56%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

100% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

61% of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Landowners: 100%
- Households: 77%
- Men: 69%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: 100%
- Civil courts: 90%
- Households themselves: 54%

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Land or shelter: 100%
- Money: 92%
- Marriage/relationships: 49%

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: 100%
- Civil courts: 90%
- Households themselves: 54%

0% of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

100% of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

### STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

4% Negative perception  
43% Positive perception  
15% Neutral perception  
38% High positive perception

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

21% Negative perception  
18% Positive perception  
0% Neutral perception  
61% High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

38% Negative perception  
18% Positive perception  
11% Neutral perception  
33% High positive perception

78% of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

Key informants reported that boys of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in Baghak.

43% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was:

- Cannot afford to pay for school related costs (100%)

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

58% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

86% of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.5

10% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use. 6, 5

22% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year. 4, 5

22% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink from. 4, 5

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

45% Negative perception 7% Positive perception
10% Neutral perception 38% High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:3

- Medicine 99%
- Travel to healthcare facilities 93%
- Fees for treatment 88%

100% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location. 4, 5

0% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.4, 5

100% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.4, 5

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

10% Negative perception 17% Positive perception
10% Neutral perception 63% High positive perception

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:6

- 14% Community development
- 14% Energy
- 14% Infrastructure
- 29% Shelter
- 43% WASH7
- 0% Other

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:6

- 89% Handcrafts
- 56% Healthcare
- 33% Religious
- 0% None

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
BASELINE EVALUATION OF PARRS

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 0% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 12% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 43% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

0% of households reported that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- 7% Agriculture
- 44% Insecurity
- 1% Lack of clean water
- 1% Lack of shelters
- 0% None

INCOME GENERATION AND ECONOMIC PROFILE

Income Generation and Economic Profile Index
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women's financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Outlook
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women's Empowerment
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women's empowerment and economic outlook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High positive</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85% of households reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

- 100% of KIs reported that women did not have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:
  - Lack of access to financial resources (100%)
  - Lack of ability to travel alone (100%)
  - The family does not allow them to own a business (78%)

- 78% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

- 22% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.
**Labour Market Perceptions**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- 0% Negative perception
- 12% Positive perception
- 56% Neutral perception
- 32% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:

- Formal employment: private/public sector - 25%
- Skilled labour - 24%
- Unskilled labour - 16%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.1

**Economic Vulnerabilities**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- 9% Negative perception
- 48% Positive perception
- 10% Neutral perception
- 33% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 7,375 AFN

Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 5,168 AFN

10% of households reported that they do not have debt.

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:

- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: 1%
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): 8%
- Rent: 16%
- Food: 9%
- Shelter repairs: 9%
- COVID-19: 8%
- Wedding/Celebrations: 0%
- Other: 39%
- Healthcare: 39%

Average reported household debt: 58,178 AFN

**Household Hunger Score**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

- Severe hunger: 5%
- Moderate hunger: 84%
- Little hunger: 11%

**Reduced Coping Strategies Index**

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

- High: 93%
- Medium: 5%
- Low: 2%

91% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:

- Government financial help: 89%
- Government material help: 89%
- UN/NGO financial help: 78%
- UN/NGO material help: 33%

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:

- Self-help groups: 0%
- Associations: 0%
- Cooperatives: 0%
- Other: 33%

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**

IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
HUMANITARIAN BASELINE FOR COMMUNITY BASE PROGRAMMING IN PRIORITY AREAS OF RETURN AND REINTEGRATION (PARR)
Uruzgan Province, Tarin Kot District, Afghanistan
Khairo Kariz
December 2021

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of households surveyed, by population group:</th>
<th>Composition of assessed households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 61%</td>
<td>Female (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-Returnee 0%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community 39%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average household size: 7.2

The following index is a calculation of the Vulnerability Index score based on key reported multi-sectoral household vulnerabilities.

- 0% High vulnerability
- 44% Moderate vulnerability
- 2% Moderate high vulnerability
- 55% Lower vulnerability

% of households reporting the number of adults in the household that have a Tazkera¹:
- 6% All
- 20% Most²
- 69% Few²

% of households being reportedly female-headed:
- 0%

% of households reporting that their head of household has a disability:
- 2%

% of households reporting that one or more members have a disability:
- 2%

**Movement Intentions**

100% of households reported having no intention to move in the next 12 months.³

No representative sample of households reported that they had movement intentions in this location.

**Refugee Returnees**

There was no refugee-returnee population interviewed in this location.

**IDPs**

Average reported time since IDP households were first displaced:* 1.7 year(s) and the average reported time since IDP households arrived in their current PARR location:* 0.1 year(s)

Main province where IDP households were living prior to current PARR location:* Uruzgan

0% of IDP households reported that their current location was not their first location of displacement.⁵

**COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP INCLUSIVITY**

**Community Leadership Inclusivity Index**
The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of local governance inclusivity, leadership accountability promotion of gender equality and effectiveness of community feedback mechanisms.

- 1% Negative perception
- 14% Positive perception
- 84% High positive perception

**Womens Leadership**
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the promotion of gender equality among community leadership structures.

- 75% Negative perception
- 3% Positive perception
- 13% Neutral perception
- 9% High positive perception

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.
2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

---
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### Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **1%** Positive perception
- **98%** Neutral perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **4%** Arbab/Malik only
- **32%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **64%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **83%** Elected by whole community
- **0%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **17%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

### Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **96%** Neutral perception
- **3%** Positive perception

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:

- **0%** In person
- **99%** Community centers
- **93%** Shura meetings

100% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.

### Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **86%** Neutral perception

### Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **22%** Positive perception
- **63%** Neutral perception

Of the 67% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:

- **0%** Most of the time
- **33%** Sometimes
- **0%** About half the time
- **67%** Very rarely
- **0%** Always
- **0%** Never

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **91%** Positive perception

Of the **100%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: **83%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **83%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: **67%**

**0%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**33%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **2%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **72%** High positive perception

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location:

- **6%** Negative perception
- **19%** Positive perception
- **72%** High positive perception

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the local leadership's management of the delivery of public services.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **5%** Positive perception
- **95%** High positive perception

**73%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were:

- Landowners: **89%**
- Community leaders: **82%**
- Business owners: **63%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: **89%**
- Community leadership sub-groups: **67%**

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were:

- Money: **96%**
- Land or shelter: **96%**
- Business disagreements: **78%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were:

- Community leadership: **89%**
- Community leadership sub-groups: **67%**

Of households reporting protection incidents, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: **83%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **83%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: **67%**

**2%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Government restrictions related to COVID-19: **83%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **83%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: **67%**

**0%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**33%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.

**67%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.

50% of KIs reported that most boys of school age were not able to attend primary school because they had to earn money instead.

83% of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school because School is too far.

Respondents could select up to three options.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Proportion (Households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional shelter</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged house</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*64% Negative perception, 23% Positive perception, 12% Neutral perception*

**Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional shelter</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged house</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion (Households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3% Negative perception, 15% Positive perception, 2% Neutral perception*

**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation arrangement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion (Households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent shelter (mud)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional shelter</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*64% Positive perception, 23% Neutral perception, 12% High positive perception*

**Proportion of households by main reported type of accommodation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*6% Negative perception, 12% Positive perception, 2% Neutral perception*

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer training</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafts</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*50% Agricultural, 0% Business, 0% Computer training, 0% Handcrafts, 0% Languages, 0% Teacher training*

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don't know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- 0% Lack of education access
- 4% Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- 1% Lack of adequate healthcare
- 93% Lack of livelihood opportunities
- 0% Unresponsive community leadership

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:
- Less than 1 year: 67%
- Between 1 and 3 years: 33%
- 5 or more years: 0%

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

83% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days. 5

Households owning businesses reported that they were not aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

4. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
8. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
# Lab Market Perceptions
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

- **21%** Negative perception
- **79%** Neutral perception

### Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- **Small business/sales/rent**: 47%
- **Unskilled labour**: 42%
- **Borrowing/loans/humanitarian assistance**: 4%

### Average number of bread winners per household: 1

# Economic Vulnerabilities
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

- **31%** Negative perception
- **43%** Neutral perception
- **14%** High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: **2,796 AFN**
Average monthly expenditure reported by households: **2,966 AFN**

### 49% of households reported that they do not have debt.

### Average household debt: **3,798 AFN**

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:
- **0%** Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members
- **23%** Rent
- **0%** Shelter repairs
- **0%** Wedding/Celebrations
- **12%** Healthcare
- **0%** Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport)
- **65%** Food
- **0%** COVID-19
- **0%** Other

### Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- **54%** Food
- **0%** Fuel/Electricity
- **21%** Rent
- **0%** Education costs
- **25%** Healthcare
- **0%** Debt repayment

### 100% of households reported that they did **not** receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

% of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- **0%** Government financial help
- **0%** Government material help
- **0%** UN/NGO financial help
- **0%** UN/NGO material help

### % of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
- **0%** Self-help groups
- **0%** Associations
- **33%** Cooperatives
- **0%** Other

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

---

**About IMPACT INITIATIVES**
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.

---

**UNHCR**
The UN Refugee Agency

---

**IMPACT**
Shaping practices. Influencing policies. Impacting lives.
3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.

1. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document. For further information, see the NRC report about civil documentation.

2. Here, few means ≤50% adults within the family and most means >50% adults within the family.

1. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
Community Leadership Inclusivity

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the overall inclusiveness of their community leadership.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **12%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

% of households reporting on their community representatives:

- **55%** Arbab/Malik only
- **1%** Shuras for smaller groups
- **45%** Shuras for entire community
- **0%** No one
- **0%** Other

% of households reporting how the selection of leadership is done:

- **52%** Elected by whole community
- **4%** Elected only by community that belongs to the same group
- **44%** Appointed by other leaders
- **0%** Other

Community Leadership Accountability

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions on the responsiveness of community leadership.

- **8%** Negative perception
- **11%** Positive perception
- **9%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

30% of households reported that they were not aware of mechanisms in place through which they could provide feedback on issues within their current location.5

% of households reporting to be aware of feedback mechanisms, top three feedback mechanisms reported:3,6

- Phone/SMS reporting line: **58%**
- AWAAZ: **55%**
- In person: **53%**

44% of key informants reported that they believed most complaints or feedback brought to community leadership will get a response.4

Community Relations and Stability

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of group coexistence, leadership legitimacy, stability and conflict within the community.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **43%** Positive perception
- **22%** Neutral perception
- **35%** High positive perception

Community Relations

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the legitimacy of community leadership in dealing with disputes.

- **2%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **6%** Neutral perception
- **85%** High positive perception

Of the 89% of KIs reporting that the community faced conflict, the following % reported the frequency of issues needing to be referred up to district or provincial level authorities:4

- **44%** Most of the time
- **56%** About half the time
- **0%** Always
- **0%** Never

The following displays the extent to which households believe members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation:

- **17%** Usually they help each other
- **0%** Never
- **21%** They always help each other
- **21%** Few or very few times
- **0%** I do not know
- **42%** They normally do, but not very often
- **8%** They normally do, but not very often

25% of KIs reported that they had not managed local disputes or conflicts between different members of the community.4,5

33% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership had sustainable solutions and did not become problems again.4,5

89% of KIs reported that they believed that issues managed by the community leadership were not handled in a fair and equitable way.4,5

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.

* As these results are for specific population groups they are not representative.
The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of peaceful coexistence between religious and ethnic groups within the community.

- **26%** Negative perception
- **56%** Neutral perception
- **14%** Positive perception
- **4%** High positive perception

Of the **67%** of KIs that reported a protection incident in the last year, the top three reported protection incidents were:

- Fear for personal safety: **100%**
- Discrimination/harassment from others groups: **83%**
- Socio-cultural barriers between settlement members and host community: **50%**

**31%** of households reported that there had not been disputes in the local community.\(^5\)

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were: \(^3,^6\)

- Landowners: **89%**
- Business owners: **77%**
- Youth: **31%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors to whom they would report the issue were: \(^3,^6\)

- Community leadership: **80%**
- Police: **46%**
- Community leadership subgroups: **26%**

Of households reporting that there are conflicts, the top three reasons were: \(^3,^6\)

- Land or shelter: **97%**
- Money: **74%**
- Business disagreements: **66%**

Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were: \(^3,^6\)

- Of households reporting conflict in the community, the top three actors involved were: **Landowners**: **89%**
- Business owners: **77%**
- Youth: **31%**

Of households reporting that there had not been disputes in the local community: \(^5\)

**0%** of KIs reported that men were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.\(^4,^5\)

**11%** of KIs reported that women were not able to move freely by themselves in the settlement.\(^4,^5\)

**STRENGTHENING PUBLIC SERVICES AND EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Strengthening Public Services and Equitable Access Index**

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of public service quality and satisfaction on a daily basis:

- **0%** Negative perception
- **10%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **90%** High positive perception

**Education**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the quality of and access to education in this location.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **2%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **98%** High positive perception

**100%** of KIs reported that there were no local shuras or community organizations that help to manage education.\(^4,^5\)

**Leadership of Service Provision**

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the local leadership’s management of the delivery of public services.

- **1%** Negative perception
- **27%** Positive perception
- **0%** Neutral perception
- **72%** High positive perception

**Key informants reported that boys of primary school age were able to attend school and did not face barriers to attend school in District 2 & 3.**

**11%** of KIs reported that most girls of school age were not able to attend primary school.

Of those, the main reported reason that girls could not attend was: \(^4\) **School is too far (100%).**

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by Key Informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
**Shelter and Land Tenure**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of shelter conditions and security of land and housing rights.

- **12%** Negative perception
- **8%** Positive perception
- **68%** High positive perception

Proportion of households by main reported type of shelter where the households are living:

- Permanent shelter (mud) **70%**
- Transitional shelter **30%**

24% of the households reported having a land tenure arrangement where they could own land that could be used for farming/agriculture.

- **68%** of households have not received threats of eviction in the last three months.

**WASH**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to water and sanitation in this location.

- **16%** Negative perception
- **7%** Positive perception
- **69%** High positive perception

11% of KIs reported that the amount of water was insufficient for everyone in the location to use.

78% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR location had not dried up in the last year.

0% of KIs reported that the main source of drinking water used by most people who live in the PARR was not safe to drink.

**Healthcare**

The following index is a composite of households' perceptions of the quality of and access to healthcare in this location.

- **0%** Negative perception
- **4%** Positive perception
- **96%** High positive perception

Of households reporting they spent money on healthcare, in the last month, the top three healthcare expenditures were for:

- Medicine **95%**
- Fees for treatment **93%**
- Travel to healthcare facilities **44%**

33% of KIs reported that there are no functioning health centers in this location.

33% of KIs reported that there are no female staff to treat women and girls.

56% of KIs reported that the community health workers or community midwives were untrained.

**PARR PROGRAMME SUPPORT ACTIVITY IMPACT**

% of households by reported type of assistance received in the last year:

- **41%** Community development
- **0%** Energy
- **50%** Infrastructure
- **5%** Shelter
- **14%** WASH

- **64%** Education
- **14%** Health
- **5%** Livelihoods
- **64%** Special assistance
- **18%** Don’t know

% of households reporting that the following vocational training would be helpful for the labour market:

- **38%** Agriculture
- **24%** Computer training
- **19%** Handcrafts
- **0%** Languages
- **38%** Teacher training

- **24%** Business
- **0%** Cosmetics
- **24%** Healthcare
- **10%** Religious
- **0%** None

---

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.

4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.

5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).

6. Respondents could select up to three options.

7. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.
% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- **2%** Lack of education access
- **0%** Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- **3%** Lack of adequate healthcare
- **55%** Lack of livelihood opportunities
- **7%** Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting receiving the following training in this location in the last year:

- **50%** Agriculture
- **25%** Computer training
- **23%** Handcrafts
- **0%** Computer training
- **1%** Business
- **9%** Healthcare
- **3%** Languages
- **0%** Teacher training
- **9%** Religious
- **0%** Other
- **0%** None

% of households by main reported problems for the community:

- **2%** Lack of education access
- **0%** Non-integrated IDP or returnee populations
- **3%** Lack of adequate healthcare
- **55%** Lack of livelihood opportunities
- **7%** Unresponsive community leadership

% of households reporting that they did not receive assistance in the last year.

100% of business owners reported a decrease in revenue in past 90 days.  

Households owning businesses reported that they had owned their business for the following amount of time:

- Less than 1 year: **100%**
- Between 1 and 3 years: **0%**
- Between 3 and 5 years: **0%**
- 5 or more years: **0%**

12% of business owners reported that there were support networks or institutions in the location that can support with money or resources for their business. The following types of networks or institutions were noted to be present:

- Community-based savings and lending: **80%**
- Bank/loans: **60%**

100% of KIs reported that women did **not** have the ability to start a business. Of these KIs, the most common reasons that women were not able to start or own businesses in the location were as follows:

- The family does not allow them to own a business: **89%**
- Lack of ability to travel alone: **67%**
- Women are punished for owning businesses: **44%**

100% of KIs reported that women were not allowed to own a business outside of their homes.

0% of KIs reported that they believed women to have the same access support for their businesses as men.

### Income Generation and Economic Profile

#### Incomes Generation and Economic Profile Index

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of economic and labor market perceptions, women’s financial accessibility, every day expenditures and economic variables:

- **14%** Negative perception
- **34%** Positive perception
- **28%** Neutral perception
- **25%** High positive perception

#### Economic Outlook

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of a long-term positive economic outlook:

- **24%** Negative perception
- **30%** Positive perception
- **7%** Neutral perception
- **40%** High positive perception

#### Women’s Empowerment

The following index is a composite of perceptions by households of women’s empowerment and economic outlook:

- **20%** Negative perception
- **3%** Positive perception
- **26%** Neutral perception
- **52%** High positive perception

73% of households reported that they were **not** aware of any NGOs working in their location to help support the community in any way in the last year.

3. The results represent the top 3 responses so some responses are not represented and the total of the values is not equal to 100%.
4. Result is reported by key informants (KIs) and is therefore not representative of the population.
5. Respondents could select from the following: yes (dark grey), no (blue) and don’t know (light grey).
6. Respondents could select up to three options.
7. Insecurity defined as a general feeling, and referred to either direct violence or perceived
Labour Market Perceptions

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of the labour market.

39% Negative perception  8% Positive perception
14% Neutral perception  40% High positive perception

Top three primary sources of income reported by households:
- Small business/sales/rent: 38%
- Skilled labour: 21%
- Formal employment: private/public sector: 20%

Average number of bread winners per household: 1.3

Household Hunger Score

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to go without food. This was calculated into Household Hunger Score (HHS), the final categories of which are shown below:

0% Severe hunger  14% Moderate hunger  86% Little hunger

Reduced Coping Strategies Index

As part of the vulnerability assessment, households were asked questions about how often they had to use coping strategies to make their food last longer. This was calculated into the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI), high referring to often using coping strategies and low to not so often:

45% High  4% Medium  51% Low

Economic Vulnerabilities

The following index is a composite of households’ perceptions of varying economic vulnerabilities.

45% Negative perception  23% Positive perception
21% Neutral perception  12% High positive perception

Average monthly income reported by households: 6,827 AFN  Average monthly expenditure reported by households: 6,376 AFN

46% of households reported that they do not have debt.  Average household debt: 30,936 AFN

Main reasons for households who reported to be indebted:
- Extra costs of hosting displaced HH members: 0%
- Costs of displacement (smuggler, transport): 0%
- Rent: 27%
- Food: 4%
- Shelter repairs: 4%
- COVID-19: 9%
- Other: 24%
- Wedding/Celebrations: 0%
- Healthcare: 33%

Average reported household expenditure in the last 30 days:
- Food: 21%
- Fuel/Electricity: 13%
- Rent: 28%
- Water: 4%
- Education costs: 7%
- Healthcare: 21%
- Debt repayment: 7%

66% of households reported that they did not receive any support from the government or NGOs, particularly for small and local businesses.

Of households who received support from government institutions or NGOs, they reported receiving the following support:
- Government financial help: 36%
- Government material help: 48%
- UN/NGO financial help: 71%
- UN/NGO material help: 94%

% of KIs who reported the types of collectives organized around business ownership that exist in PARR locations:
- Self-help groups: 0%
- Associations: 0%
- Cooperatives: 0%
- Other: 5%

About IMPACT INITIATIVES
IMPACT initiatives (IMPACT) is a leading Geneva-based think and do tank, created in 2010. IMPACT aims to shape practices and influence policies in humanitarian and development settings in order to positively impact the lives of people and their communities.
For this assessment, a composite indicator for 14 separate measures of progress were calculated from the HH results. This composite indicator combined the reported results from a series of Likert-scale questions ranking overall agreement or disagreement with different questions relating to the composite indicator (shown in the right-hand column). These composite indicators were used in turn combined to measure progress over four key objectives. This allowed IMPACT to produce an index for each major indicator, which could be compared against the programme goals. For each composite indicator, the indicators were added up, and were then divided by 9 (the total possible value of each sub-composite index). This scale was then broken into five ordinal categories based on rank, as seen in the center column below.

### Calculation of the composite indicator

Step 1: For each indicator, average of the response
Step 2: Normalize the score of the average response and divide by the total
Step 3: Report this score on the ranking
Step 4: Calculate the % of the result for each ranking for each indicator of the composite index
Step 5: The higher the score is, better the perception by households

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Likert scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 0.20</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21 – 0.4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 – 0.6</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refuse to answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDEX 1</td>
<td>Community leadership inclusivity</td>
<td>I believe that the community leadership responds to all households in this location equally, regardless of tribe, displacement status or gender.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community leadership accountability to the community</td>
<td>I think that the feedback mechanisms are an effective way of holding people in charge accountable for their actions.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am confident that any complaint, suggestion or comment submitted through the mechanism will get a response.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2</td>
<td>If I need the support of the community leader to solve an issue, I trust that &quot;my side&quot; of the story will be heard.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community inclusivity by leadership</td>
<td>I feel that community leadership is making an effort to be accountable to the wider community living in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel my rights as a community member are respected by the local authorities in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>Community leaders are playing an important role in supporting women in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of gender equality</td>
<td>Women can trust the community (leaders) supportiveness to play an active role in the this location community.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A woman can be a leader in this location, just like a man can.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 4</strong></td>
<td>Services quality and access</td>
<td>ESNFI/HLP</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the quality of shelter where my household and I live in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone who moves here from outside of this location can easily access land or housing if they need it.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal services are able to help any household looking for housing or land.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 5</strong></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with the healthcare access and treatment that is available for myself and my household in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The health personnel at the health centers in this location are well trained.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every community member has the same access to healthcare services in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 6</strong></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with the quality of education that exists for children in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every community member has the same access to education services in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can rely on the available education services in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 7</strong></td>
<td>WASH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my household’s access to sufficient water in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every community member has the same access to water services in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can rely on the available water services in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 8</strong></td>
<td>Leadership and service provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe that the community leadership is providing resources in a way that is beneficial for the larger community.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 9</strong></td>
<td>Livelihoods and economic outlook</td>
<td>Economic outlook for women/girls</td>
<td>Women are being more and more encouraged to find a job in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A woman in this location is allowed to have a bank account under her name.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls are being encouraged to receive the same level and years of education as boys in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 10</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions of the labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are a growing number of jobs available in the area where I live.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The opportunities in the market are improving, with better salaries.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing enterprises or businesses have difficulties finding employees with the right education/technical background in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX 3
Livelihoods and economic outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 11</td>
<td>I, or other members of my household, have to travel long distances for employment/to find a job.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is more difficult for me and members of my household to find a job than other households in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 12</td>
<td>I am confident my household will have a secure income in the coming 12 months.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My household has a secure income from employment that is able to cover my basic needs.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDEX 4
Community stability and relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 13</td>
<td>I can trust everyone living in this location community regardless of their ethnic, religious, or tribal background.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The communication between the community members and the community leadership/local governance has improved over the past year.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community leaders are taking measures to strengthen relations between different groups within this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 14</td>
<td>Certain areas in this location I prefer to try to avoid because I do not feel safe.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that the authorities can deal with crime, disputes, or threats to the community when needed.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is currently conflict between different groups in the community.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are violent incidents in this location that affect my household’s physical safety.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel secure in my household and do not worry about eviction or needing to find a new place to live.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Vulnerability Index is the sum of 9 vulnerability components: Tazkera, demographics, livelihoods, markets and food security, ESNFI/HLP, humanitarian assistance, community support, protection and access to government services. This vulnerability index has categorized 18 indicators from the HH tool into these vulnerability components. To ensure each category is equally represented in the calculation, a weight has been added to each indicator. The sum of these indicators was in turn calculated to determine the vulnerability level of each household. The higher the index, the less vulnerability the HH faces. HHs were categorized as “high risk, moderate high risk, moderate risk, lower risk.”

Calculation of the composite indicator
Step 1: Multiply the scores of the individual factors by their respective weights
Step 2: Add up the multiplied scored of all factors
Step 3: Divide the sum by 21
Step 4: A lower score, the higher the vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tazkera</td>
<td>How many adult members of the household have a tazkera?</td>
<td>all, most, few, one, none</td>
<td>1: all, most; 0.5: few, one; 0: none</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Potential demographic factors contributing to vulnerability</td>
<td>Final calculated gender of the head of the household</td>
<td>female, male</td>
<td>1: male; 0: female</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whether someone in the household has a disability that prevents them from carrying normal activities.</td>
<td>1, 0</td>
<td>1: 0; 0: 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Livelihoods</td>
<td>What is the primary income-generating activity in your household?</td>
<td>Farming/Agriculture, Livestock Production, Formal employment: Private or Public Sector, Small business/sales/rent, Skilled labour, carpenter, electrician, mechanic, driver, construction, Unskilled labour, domestic work, manual labor, Borrowing/loans/humanitarian assistance, Remittance, Other, None</td>
<td>&quot;1: agriculture, livestock, employment, small business, skilled labour; 0: unskilled labour, assistance, remittance, none; NA: other&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the household currently have debt?</td>
<td>yes, no</td>
<td>1: no; 0: yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 4</strong> Food security and markets</td>
<td>Household hunger scale</td>
<td>&quot;Low&lt;br&gt;Medium&lt;br&gt;High&lt;br&gt;None&quot;</td>
<td>1: Low, None&lt;br&gt;0: Medium, High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How far from your household is this nearest marketplace or grocery store, where you could buy food and non-food items?</td>
<td>&quot;Within 2 km Further than 2 km but inside the location No, none accessible for this population in the location</td>
<td>1: less than 2km&lt;br&gt;0.5: farther than 2km&lt;br&gt;0: not accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 5</strong> ESNFI/HLP</td>
<td>What type of shelter does your household live in?</td>
<td>Tent&lt;br&gt;Transitional shelter&lt;br&gt;Permanent shelter (mud)&lt;br&gt;Permanent shelter (fired bricks)&lt;br&gt;Open space&lt;br&gt;Damaged house&lt;br&gt;Make shifts shelter&lt;br&gt;Collective center (not intended for living)</td>
<td>1: permanent_mud, permanent_brick, transitional&lt;br&gt;0: tent, open_space, damaged, makeshift, collective_centre</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What type of tenure agreement does your household have?</td>
<td>Written agreement&lt;br&gt;Verbal agreement&lt;br&gt;None (occupied without permission)&lt;br&gt;Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1: written&lt;br&gt;0.5: verbal&lt;br&gt;0: none&lt;br&gt;NA: prefer_not</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has your household received any threats of eviction in the last 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes&lt;br&gt;No&lt;br&gt;Don't know&lt;br&gt;Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1: no&lt;br&gt;0: yes</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 6</strong> Humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>Are you aware of any NGOs working in this location to help support the community in any way in the last year?</td>
<td>Yes&lt;br&gt;No&lt;br&gt;Don't know&lt;br&gt;Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1: yes&lt;br&gt;0: no&lt;br&gt;NA: dont_know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 7</strong> Community support</td>
<td>To what extent do you think members of the community in this location are helping each other in dealing with the current situation?</td>
<td>Never&lt;br&gt;Few or very few times&lt;br&gt;They normally do, but not very often&lt;br&gt;Usually they help each other&lt;br&gt;They always help each other&lt;br&gt;I do not know&lt;br&gt;Refuse to answer</td>
<td>1: help_always, help_sometimes, often&lt;br&gt;0: few, never&lt;br&gt;NA: dont_know, refuse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 8</strong> Protection</td>
<td>Certain areas in this location I prefer to try to avoid because I do not feel safe</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is currently conflict between different groups in the community.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are violent incidents in this location that affect my household’s physical safety.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 9</strong> Access to quality government services</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the healthcare access and treatment that is available for myself and my household in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with the quality of education that exists for children in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my household’s access to sufficient water in this location.</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>1-5,NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below sampling frame applies to the HH surveys that were conducted in the PARR locations. IMPACT took the most recent statistics from the total population of the assessed areas in order to determine the sampling target required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>HHI Sampling Target Needed</th>
<th>HHI Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Refugee Returnees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamyan</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapisa</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>30,537</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khosh</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunar</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghman</td>
<td>43,249</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangarhar</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faryab</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badakhshan</td>
<td>18,130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghlan</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takhar</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmand</td>
<td>21,693</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabul</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruzgan</td>
<td>24,565</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandahar</td>
<td>5,377</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat</td>
<td>30,135</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghor</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badghis</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394,065</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>