

UNHCR - MALAWI

**HOUSEHOLD SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT –
2017 (HSELA17)**



SURVEY RESULT REPORT

Refugees, asylum seekers and host communities

**Stein Terje Vikan
Team Leader**

10 October 2017

MAINSTREAMING LIVELIHOODS INTO SOCIAL PROTECTION PROGRAMMING IN MALAWI OPERATION

Enabling vulnerable refugees, asylum seekers and host communities including men, women and children in camps and selected communities to undertake self-sufficiency livelihoods related work for food security and income earning based on current evidence.

© PART OF THE MULTI-YEAR LIVELIHOODS STRATEGY PROGRAMME OF UNHCR, MALAWI.

Report produced in October 2017

All rights reserved. UNHCR retains copyright for this material. However, it may be reproduced for programming training and policy development purposes for free. The Multi-Year Livelihoods Strategy programme of UNHCR will need to be informed and appropriately acknowledged. No part of this data may be reproduced by any means, electronic, mechanical, by photocopying, by recording or otherwise for the purpose of profit without the prior written consent of the copyright holders. Permission may be granted free of charge to non-profit organisations.

Statistician

Stein Terje Vikan

Field Manager and qualitative work

Francis Maguza-Tembo

Research Assistant

Innocent Panga Panga Phiri

Financial support for this project was provided by the livelihoods programme of the Regional Office of Southern Africa (ROSA), Pretoria South Africa and field support by UNHCR Malawi operation.

Acknowledgements

This Household Socio-Economic and Livelihoods Survey 2017 (HSELA17) is the result of dedicated efforts of many people who contributed in various ways to the successful collection, analysis and compilation of the data. We sincerely acknowledge the guidance of many people from Geneva, Pretoria, and in Malawi in contributing to the design framework of the work. Dr. Prosper B. Matondi and Line Pedersen were inspirational in the completion of this work. In the commissioned work, we worked very closely with Marc Petzoldt, Ana Ramirez, Petra Nahmias and backed strongly by Innocent Panga Panga Phiri in Malawi. Francis Maguza-Tembo led the field team with Prosper from the training of field enumerators, field-testing, data collection and ensuring that resources for fieldwork were available. The Malawi UNHCR office was supportive behind the scenes, and we acknowledge their contributions. We gratefully thank the team of field enumerators and the respondents for their patience in responding to our questions. Hopefully, they will see value in this evidence, as UNHCR embarks on strengthening its livelihoods programme.

The views and interpretation of the data in this report is solely the responsibility of the author and not UNHCR or its partners.

Stein Terje Vikan
Team Leader,
Lilongwe, Malawi

Foreword

UNHCR Malawi operation is enhancing livelihoods as key to social protection of refugees and asylum seekers. The last few years, characterized by the world food crisis and economic recession, requires strategic thinking on how to address these challenges. We have designed a Multi-Year Livelihoods Strategy backed by the evidence in this report. The solutions that are dependent on aid alone, are inadequate to meet the challenges that refugees face. In addition, limited resources have also meant that UNHCR has fallen short of the requirements to address challenges that host communities equally face. However, the world has progressed in the last ten years despite these problems. For instance, the growth of communication systems technologies, greater opportunities for income earning, economic liberalization etc. has not benefitted the poor to the degree possible. Persons of Concern (PoCs) largely remain recipients of relief aid, proving time and again not to be sustainable.

This evidence gathered after a protracted design process is aimed at helping the communities we work with to use evidence as a basis for assessing impact. We have come to realize that in spite of providing opportunities through funding to PoC, we have invested less in helping them to help themselves. Key questions remain on why PoC with certain skills remain vulnerable despite many years of support through our partners? Are the investments reaching the targeted poor communities? Could it be that the strategies for investing in these communities have been poor or inadequate to address the problems? What would be the most appropriate form and level of intervention? What can be done in a holistic sense at individual, family, village/zone, district or at institutional level to address the bottlenecks? It is not easy to answer these questions. This is why we commissioned this work.

Our aim based on this evidence is to use development resources to strengthen the local human resource base and systems, because there are indeed livelihoods opportunities that have not been fully explored. It also means working with local institutions in creating the environment for livelihoods projects to prosper. We raise livelihoods issues to a higher pedestal simply because it was an area that has been neglected and yet it is fundamental for the life of PoC. Through this evidence, we are placing greater emphasis on the people and critical factors that determine the way they live. We are very clear that emphasis should be placed on the economic development of PoC through income generating activities. We place a premium on market based value chains, testing projects, training, capacity development and learning on livelihoods mainstreaming. An important novelty we bring through this evidence, is the idea of rebuilding self-development through emphasizing mindset change and rediscovering the power of possibilities through livelihoods mainstreaming.

Ms. Monique Ekoko
UNHCR Country Representative
Lilongwe, Malawi, October 2017

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Foreword | iv |
| Executive Summary..... | vii |
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background and scope | 1 |
| 1.2 Objectives..... | 2 |
| 2.0 Methodological issues | 4 |
| 2.1 Sample design background | 4 |
| 2.2 Sample precision | 5 |
| 2.3 Qualitative data collection | 6 |
| 2.4 Limitations of the survey and comparisons to other data from Malawi | 6 |
| 3.0 Demographic information..... | 7 |
| 3.1 Registration groups and host communities | 7 |
| 3.2 Age structure..... | 7 |
| 3.3 Marital status | 7 |
| 3.4 Nationality..... | 8 |
| 3.5 Conclusions | 8 |
| 4.0 Household shelter and access to amenities | 10 |
| 4.1 Context..... | 10 |
| 4.2 Characteristics of dwellings | 10 |
| 4.3 Access to housing amenities and waste disposal | 11 |
| 4.4 Access to lighting facilities and energy for cooking | 12 |
| 4.5 Conclusion and program implications | 14 |
| 5 Humanitarian and special needs | 15 |
| 5.1 Humanitarian assistance | 15 |
| 5.2 Special needs and child labor | 16 |
| 5.2.1 <i>Special needs</i> | 16 |
| 5.2.2 <i>Women's access to hygienic services</i> | 16 |
| 5.2.3 <i>Children and work</i> | 17 |
| 5.3 Conclusion | 17 |
| 6.0 Livelihoods | 18 |
| 6.1 Context..... | 18 |
| 6.2 Source of income: agriculture | 18 |
| 6.2.1 <i>Agriculture income</i> | 18 |
| 6.2.2 <i>Source of income: self employment in agriculture</i> | 18 |
| 6.2.3 <i>Source of income: remittances</i> | 19 |
| 6.2.4 <i>Source of income: employed by someone</i> | 19 |
| 6.2.5 <i>Employment type by nationality</i> | 19 |
| 6.2.6 <i>Sources of income and payment methods</i> | 20 |
| 6.3 Access to land and water | 21 |
| 6.3.1 <i>Access to land for agriculture</i> | 21 |
| 6.3.2 <i>Access to irrigation water</i> | 21 |
| 6.4 Crop production trends..... | 22 |
| 6.4.1 <i>Types of crops grown</i> | 22 |
| 6.4.2 <i>Usage of fertilizer for crops grown</i> | 23 |
| 6.4.3 <i>Pesticides usage</i> | 23 |
| 6.4.4 <i>Source of capital for agricultural inputs</i> | 23 |
| 6.4.5 <i>Crop production output</i> | 24 |
| 6.5 Livestock..... | 24 |
| 6.6 Challenges in agriculture related livelihoods | 25 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| 6.7 | Non-agricultural livelihoods activities..... | 25 |
| 6.7.1 | <i>Types of non-agricultural activities</i> | 25 |
| 6.7.2 | <i>Challenges in non-agricultural businesses</i> | 26 |
| 6.7.3 | <i>Challenges in finding employment</i> | 27 |
| 6.8 | Skills training related to livelihoods | 28 |
| 6.9 | Savings and access to financial services..... | 28 |
| 6.10 | Conclusion..... | 30 |
| 7.0 | Poverty, vulnerability and food security | 32 |
| 7.1 | Poverty and food insecurity | 32 |
| 7.2 | Poverty and consumption | 32 |
| 7.3 | Food insecurity..... | 33 |
| 7.4 | Coping adaptations when lacking food..... | 34 |
| 7.5 | Conclusion..... | 35 |
| 8.0 | Safety and security | 36 |
| 8.1 | Insecurity incidences..... | 36 |
| 8.2 | Movement during the day | 37 |
| 8.3 | Relationships with host communities..... | 37 |
| 8.4 | Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV) issues..... | 38 |
| 8.5 | Conclusion..... | 39 |
| 9.0 | Media use | 41 |
| 9.1 | Access to and use of various communication tools and media..... | 41 |
| 9.2 | Cellphone ownership | 41 |
| 9.3 | Radio as a means of communication | 41 |
| 9.4 | Content development..... | 41 |
| 9.5 | Conclusion..... | 42 |
| 10.0 | Subjective assessment of well-being | 43 |
| 10.1 | Non food items as a measure of well being..... | 43 |
| 10.2 | Income as a measure of well being..... | 43 |
| 10.3 | Conclusion..... | 44 |
| 11.0 | Analysis of findings and recommendations | 45 |
| 11.1 | Analysis of findings..... | 45 |
| 11.1.1 | <i>Complexity of refugee surveys and studies</i> | 45 |
| 11.1.2 | <i>Demographic patterns</i> | 45 |
| 11.1.3 | <i>Shelter, assets and household services</i> | 45 |
| 11.1.4 | <i>Status of humanitarian assistance</i> | 45 |
| 11.1.5 | <i>Livelihoods opportunities and income sources</i> | 46 |
| 11.1.6 | <i>Agriculture as a source of income and food</i> | 46 |
| 11.1.7 | <i>Non-agriculture sources of income</i> | 46 |
| 11.1.8 | <i>Productive support systems for refugees and host communities</i> | 46 |
| 11.1.9 | <i>Food expenditure and consumption patterns</i> | 47 |
| 11.1.10 | <i>Security and relations of refugees with host communities</i> | 47 |
| 11.1.11 | <i>Communication</i> | 47 |
| 11.2 | Recommendations | 47 |
| 11.2.1 | <i>Shelter and services</i> | 47 |
| 11.2.2 | <i>Special needs and child labor</i> | 48 |
| 11.2.3 | <i>Livelihoods</i> | 48 |
| 11.2.4 | <i>Vulnerability and food insecurity</i> | 49 |
| 11.2.5 | <i>Decision-making and social cohesion</i> | 49 |
| 11.2.6 | <i>Safety and security</i> | 50 |
| 11.2.7 | <i>Media use</i> | 50 |
| 12.0 | Conclusion | 51 |

Executive Summary

The Household Socio-Economic and Livelihood Assessments (HSELA) is part of the compliance requirements for the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) in all countries it undertakes livelihoods programming work. The HSELA commissioned for Malawi covered a wide range of issues beyond livelihoods, and was designed with a scope to identify issues that affect positively or negatively on livelihoods for refugees and selected host communities. The survey results were to help the Malawi office in its multi-year, multi-partnership planning and programming, when used together with the Standard Expanded Nutrition Survey (SENS) 2017, and the Joint Assessment Monitoring (JAM).

The main objective of HSELA was to provide an overview of the livelihood and vulnerability situation of refugees and host families in Malawi. The survey adopted a comparison approach of the main camp called Dzaleka in Dowa district, which is 47 kilometers from Lilongwe the state capital in the central region, and Luwani refugee camp in the southern region. Sampled households living in villages surrounding the two camps were interviewed during the survey in March of 2017.

Dzaleka camp is well established and has been in existence since 1994 and hosts approximately 10,700 households from a number of neighboring countries, including Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda, Burundi and others. Luwani camp is relatively new and exclusively hosts around 800 households who are Mozambican asylum seekers whose status was not yet determined at the time of the survey. The camps are managed by the Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security, with the support of UNHCR and its partners including the World Food Programme, Plan Malawi, Churches Action in Relief and Development (CARD), Jesuit Refugees Services (JRS), as well as the Ministry of Health. Government provides administrative services as part of the Refugee Department in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security. There are also independent organisations, particularly church-based, that provide a variety of services in the two camps.

The survey was commissioned to provide solid statistical information on the two camps. The design process of the survey was protracted, as it was an opportunity for UNHCR to test the Global Livelihoods Indicators, that is: 1. Agriculture; 2. Employment; Self-employment; and related support services, skills capacity, financial and assets. At the same time, it incorporated a variety of Units in UNHCR providing services in the area of protection, demographics (household profiles, education, schooling), special needs, health, shelter, water and hygiene services, food consumption and expenditure, communication and self-assessed poverty. It was notable that UNHCR and its partners provided food and non-food items to refugees within the programming parameters collectively defined through a multi-year, multi-partnership arrangement.

The survey used a mixed approach with a stronger emphasis on quantitative data collection (sample of 1262), with qualitative work (12 Focused Group Discussions – FGDs) having been undertaken. Questions were formulated consultatively with the management units of UNHCR in Malawi, at the Regional Office in Pretoria, and the programming team in Geneva and Copenhagen. In addition to using the ProGress household profiles, to understand the host population, some questions were aligned to the Integrated Household Survey (IHS) undertaken by the Government of Malawi and partners. These were tested in the field and compared with questions from other UNHCR surveys from Madagascar, Zambia, etc.

In order to understand more comprehensively the refugee population, the two surrounding areas have smaller sample sizes and were meant to be indicative comparison for the two camp populations. Therefore, comparisons with IHS with a large sample size of 12,000 and several rounds of follow up was not possible because of the small sample size of HSELA. The quantitative data was linked directly to UNHCR ProGress IV data that predefined the household profiles in the camp in the last quarter of 2016 and first quarter of 2017, when UNHCR had completed a verification of refugees and asylum seekers (within and outside of the camps). Through this, it established that there were over 33,000 individuals. UNHCR has a continuous process of registration given the high movement of people in and out of the camps on a regular basis as they seek protection or registration as refugees. However, this survey focused on refugee and asylum seekers living in the camps. The following were the significant results:

1. **Demographics:** Dzaleka camp shows the usual pattern with a majority of households being male-headed. All other locations have a slight majority of female-headed households. In both camps approximately nine out of ten people are in the working age of 18-59 years of age. The remaining were either children or elderly. There were lower educational levels in surrounding communities, with high rates of spousal separation as compared to the camps. Matters of domestic violence featured prominently during the FGDs, over financial resources and diverse socio-cultural issues.
2. **Special needs:** About ten percent of households across all areas have a disabled member. A similar proportion has a child working during school hours. These households may need extra support to care for their disabled members and ensure children are going to school.
3. **Shelter and services:** In the two camps and surrounding areas there was limited use of safe drinking water, limited access to sufficient toilet facilities and high use of biomass for cooking fuel.
4. **Agriculture:** There are relatively few households engaged in agriculture even in the well-established Dzaleka camp because of limitations in access to land. The surrounding areas had a relatively larger percentage of households engaged in crop and livestock farming, while at Dzaleka only a few accessed land for vegetable production through a variety of lease arrangements.
5. **Employment:** In Luwani camp the newly arrived households are still relying on assistance for their livelihoods. For both camps there seem to be limited employment opportunities.
6. **Self-employment in non-agriculture activities:** Some households in Dzaleka camp are engaged in non-agricultural activities, but most are of a low technological level. Livestock rearing is also relatively low in the camps. In summary, there are major challenges related to sustainable income-generating activities for the populations of the two camps.
7. **Poverty and food insecurity:** Luwani camp stands out. The population of Luwani camp has the lowest level of expenditure, with the highest proportion of their expenditure going to food, and the highest level of food insecure households. The use of coping mechanism was high in both camps, but all areas showed signs of stress. This may be due to the humanitarian crisis that Malawi was still in the midst of at the time of data collection.
8. **Security:** Dzaleka camp has the highest levels of security incidences, but most are of a less severe nature.
9. **Communication:** Dzaleka camp is also the place with the highest level of internet and social media use. In other areas, and to some extent also Dzaleka camp, radio seems to be the most efficient media for reaching out with various messages.
10. **Poverty and vulnerability:** Through self-reporting, several measurements were provided, with asset ownership being central to the classification undertaken during the qualitative interviews. Having nothing and depending on aid was in the majority for both host and refugees. While housing and other material attributes resembled being better-off.

Key conclusions reached from the data shows significant challenges for refugees, asylum seekers and host populations across a range of issues. The report is elaborate with its central focus being on understanding the households' livelihoods conditions. For refugees and asylum seekers these are part of their long-drawn struggles against adversity. In this context the design was deliberate in aiming to better understand the context in which refugees and asylum seekers in particular, undertake economic activities and derive resources from a wide range of sources for a living. Key to the use of the data is how to benchmark plans and programmes collectively, where livelihoods are central. This does not mean that other programmes are less important. In fact, a holistic understanding of protection, humanitarian and food security, helps to better place the multi-year livelihoods strategy based on the agreed global benchmarks. The Malawi household profiles are thus crucial to baseline comprehensively and develop effective monitoring and learning implementation plans.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background and scope

The Malawi UNHCR operation is strengthening its livelihoods programme through refining implementation modalities based on evidence and projections on impact into the future. A multi-year livelihoods strategic plan intended to guide the implementation has been designed in response to the social protection needs of refugees, asylum seekers and identified host communities. In the current context, the Malawi operation has a mandate for refugees and asylum seekers in Dzaleka camp with 27,400 Persons of Concern (PoC) or just over 10,700 households living in camp¹ in Dowa district in the central region of Malawi. In addition, in the southern region, Luwani Camp in Neno district contains a population of 3,072 or just over 800 households. Altogether Malawi has provided refugee status to just over 8,000 individuals with the rights to live in Malawi and based on the 1989 Refugee Act².

A key contextual matter is that the Government of Malawi's Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security (MoHIS) is planning the relocation of Dzaleka camp and its transformation into a village settlement with a strong emphasis on livelihoods. The process of moving the camp is conceived as a village settlement model where the incoming asylum seekers are redirected to Katiri in Karonga district in the northern region of Malawi³. This Household Socio-Economic and Livelihoods Assessment 2017 (HSELA2017) will not cover household data collection in Katiri, but helps in better understanding the refugee population and matching with relevant livelihoods activities at design stage for future implementation when the relocation eventually takes place.

The multi-year livelihoods strategy is to invest in refugees, asylum seekers and in host communities for the first time since 1994 in Malawi. This cooperation establishes long-term sustainable livelihoods strategies that maximize the resources to be mobilized. The livelihoods model is based on building and strengthening the capacity of this combined population to invest in sustainable livelihoods. For these reasons local administration and traditional authorities identified Dzaleka as an area of priority for testing this comprehensive livelihood approach.

A key challenge that had been identified in sustaining long-term livelihoods investments is the protracted nature of poverty, the impact of a combination of droughts and floods and vulnerability in the camps and surrounding areas with complex causal links. The spirals of droughts, floods and stable above normal rains has an impact on a largely subsistence based

¹ The Malawi verification exercise was done in October to December of 2016. Some 27,400 refugees and asylum seekers provided their address as Dzaleka, though for a variety of reasons they could also be living outside the camp. The majority of the refugees and asylum seekers are from DRC, followed by Rwanda and Burundi, with the rest being small populations from a variety of countries. Malawi has a soft encampment policy. The Luwani case involves Mozambicans asylum seekers.

² The reservations are: limited to the right to work, access to land (and therefore water resources for agriculture), and limited movement outside the district with designated camps. Nonetheless, some of the refugees and asylum seekers work in different parts of Malawi and there is significant movement in and out of the camps, in particular Dzaleka.

³ The SES will in future also need to be undertaken in Katiri ideally before refugees are allocated land for cultivation and setting up of a business centre. The MoHIS is working on the urgent design. To collect data prior to settlement will provide a strong foundation for future monitoring of the impact of the settlement and how livelihoods activities impact the host communities and refugees.

agriculture economy of Malawi. Acute poverty, the collapse of traditional livelihoods⁴ is having a reinforcing effect on livelihoods in Malawi in general in a context of globalization. The effects of climate change and environmental degradation overlap and reinforce the competition over scarce resources, placing refugees as low priority in national systems. A sound and responsive livelihoods program requires good evidence to understand the breadth and extent of it, and how different groups/classes of refugees/asylum seekers and host communities are affected. Previous livelihood programmes did not result in the intended outcomes and livelihoods programming was downscaled in January 2016. The UNHCR Global Livelihoods Unit, developed a livelihoods compliance system to support countries, which required that they undertake: household socio-economic surveys; institutional mapping; market assessments and multi-year livelihoods strategic plans.

Refugee/asylum seeker and host populations face a variety of vulnerabilities, expressed through food insecurity, caused by a combination of droughts and floods in the last decade. The income generation options from agricultural land have been limited in a context where refugees and asylum seekers are camped on limited land of 201 hectares. Both refugees and host communities receive only partial food assistance due to limited funding available for Malawi from the government and donor programs, spearheaded by the World Food Programme (WFP). While UNHCR conducted nutrition surveys to better examine the nutrition situation of refugees, an information gap remained on the situation of livelihoods for PoCs and host communities.

There is thus a need for new and updated information on the refugee and host population in Malawi to inform planning. The current survey provides up-to-date information on livelihoods, shelter, security, access to services, use of media and a range of other topics on the refugee and host populations in Dzaleka and Luwani.

1.2 Objectives

The main objective of 'Household Socio-Economic and Livelihood Assessments' (HSELA17) is to provide an overview of the livelihood and vulnerability situation of refugee, asylum seeker and host community' families in Malawi. Specific objectives are:

1. Provide a basic description of socio-economic indicators for refugees, asylum seekers and targeted host communities as baseline information for the livelihoods programme and as input towards a monitoring and evaluation plan;
2. Gather information on protection risks and challenges resulting from the lack of access to livelihoods opportunities in refugee and host community contexts;
3. Assess the food expenditure, consumptions trends of refugees and host communities;
4. Examine how UNHCR can be more effective in using data to improve programming and reach the most vulnerable;
5. Use the evidence for advocacy on livelihoods (rights to decent work, access to resources, inclusion in national policy and planning systems) for refugees and asylum seekers.

The next chapter looks at the methodology applied in the survey. The main findings of the survey are then presented in the following chapters. The last chapter looks at recommendations emanating from the findings.

⁴ Past income generating activities such as sewing or dress making, shoe repairs, food processing, Low Input Vegetable Gardens face heavy competition from imports, rendering production uncompetitive.

2.0 Methodological issues

2.1 Sample design background

The aim of the survey is to describe the livelihoods and socio-economic conditions of households living in two separate refugee camps in Malawi, Luwani and Dzaleka camps, and to compare the two camps, while taking into consideration some of the differences⁵. For the two camps, the United Nations High Commission for Refugee (UNHCR), Malawi operation identified neighboring villages where support may also be given. This Household Socio-Economic and Livelihoods Assessment 2017 (HSELA17) was limited in its capacity to do an in-depth comparison of these communities. It was important that the sampling strategy captured the four surveys distinctly, based on sufficient background information. This would have helped the sampling framework to provide reliable and weighty data. However, the main focus remained the camp population, which is why the sample is heavily skewed on Dzaleka camp. It was therefore decided by the design team that the precision level would be higher for the camp populations than for the host populations.

The two camps are different in nature. Dzaleka camp hosts approximately 10,700 households from a number of neighboring countries, including Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC,) Rwanda, Burundi and others. Dzaleka camp is the largest in terms of population size, infrastructure and has more services than Luwani, with 9 living zones and business areas designated. It is the most diverse in terms of the background of the refugees by nationality, age, prior self-recorded skill sets, gender, household size, frequency of arrival and exit etc. It is therefore important to be able to provide data for some key indicators for some sub-groups within Dzaleka camp. The surrounding area to Dzaleka, hereafter called Dzaleka host population, consists of 12 villages selected by UNHCR in consultation with Traditional Authorities and the Local Authority for Dowa district. The 12 villages selected have an approximate number of 1,800 households.

Luwani camp is exclusively hosting Mozambican asylum seekers and at last count had 800 households housed on 10 zones. The surrounding area, hereafter called Luwani host population, consists of 6 villages and has approximately 4,600 households. These 6 villages were selected for programming purposes by the UNHCR in consultation with the Neno district Local Authority.

It should be noted that an important point for both sampling and analysis purposes is the way UNHCR registers refugees and how this differs from traditional definitions of households. In Dzaleka there are at last count 10,700 registration groups. Of these, 3197 groups only contain one person. Some of these single persons could be living together under one roof in the camp and share some resource, but for many purposes they still operate as unrelated individuals. It is therefore difficult to count several of such single persons living together as one household. Other groups with several members may be more similar to a traditional household.

⁵ Dzaleka camp is in the central region of Malawi with better agro-climatic regimes for crop production. Luwani is in the southern region that is dry with limited livelihoods opportunities.

For the purposes of this survey, a registration group (that is regarded as a household depending on specific family circumstances) was considered as a sampling unit. However, when interviewing the selected unit, the members of the household were counted in a traditional way (i.e. the interviewers asked about all individuals that were considered as part of the selected registration group’s household).

2.2 Sample precision

Precision is a key feature when calculating sample size for a survey. This survey will use precision at 95 percent, which is common in social surveys, meaning that in 95 percent of the cases, it gives assurance of the true value of an indicator, which falls within the confidence interval of the said indicator. As mentioned above, the accepted confidence interval in this survey varies between the camp and the host populations. For the surrounding host population, only indicative information was needed. The survey opted to reduce the precision of these two components (Dzaleka host and Luwani host) to 10 percent either side in order to allow for a higher sample in the camps.

For Luwani camp, which is a fairly homogenous camp with asylum seekers only from Mozambique, the design frame opted for a confidence interval of 6 percent either side. Dzaleka is a larger camp with refugees from different countries and there is thus a greater need for more sub-group comparison. There are three main countries of origin from which the asylum seekers originate: DRC, Burundi and Rwanda. Given that the sizes of these population groups are not similar, the survey had to ensure enough respondents from these groups to allow proper analysis to help in planning and programming for larger populations. The aim was to ensure that the precision was as high as possible for Dzaleka. The accepted confidence interval was approximately six percent precision on either side for each of the three sub-groups.

Given the small geographical size of all 4 areas, and a desire to eliminate design effect, the sampling was conducted using a simple random approach. However, the survey teams experienced some challenges in locating selected sampling units, which lead to a high use of replacement units, especially in Dzaleka camp. In the end, sufficient numbers of households were identified, but with some challenges in terms of country of origin distribution.

Table 2.1: Total sample size of the survey for the survey areas

| Area | Population, hh | Sample size, hh | Percent of sample |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Dzaleka Camp | 7955 | 802 | 10 |
| Dzaleka Community | 1778 | 124 | 7 |
| Luwani Camp | 800 | 222 | 28 |
| Luwani Community* | 1003 | 97 | 9.7 |
| Total | 11,536 | 1245 | 10.8 |

Notes:

* The 6 Luwani host villages have a population of 4614. With a national average household size in Malawi of 4.6 persons per family (NSO, 2013), this gives 1003 households.

It should be reiterated that figures in this report for the host communities have a lower level of precision than figures from the camp populations. Small differences were thus ignored in the reporting as the differences of at least 10-15 percentage points were of no significance for analysis purpose. It should also be noted that for some livelihoods indicators there is a star where less than 30 respondents responded to a particular question. This is to indicate these

figures have less accuracy and are thus more of an indicative nature. The report does not present figures if there were less than 10 respondents for a particular question.

The data was collected using KOBO collect, which is the data collection toolkit used by UNHCR. A team from Copenhagen supported the Malawi team during implementation. Supervisors were drawn from Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR) in Malawi. A week-long training, piloting and standardizing of the key measurements was carried out. A full-scale pilot was conducted prior to the survey. The data was collected between 6 and 29 March 2017.

2.3 Qualitative data collection

The HSELA17 did not undertake in-depth qualitative work, which would have included Key Informant Interviews, capturing stories of significance, detailed observations or transect walks. Rather twelve Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) targeting refugees (men, women and youth) and the host communities were undertaken. In total the exercise had three focus group discussions in the camp and three in the host for each of the categories in the four survey sites. The participants were randomly selected during the deployment of enumerators, and three supervisors facilitated the discussions. Prior to the commencement of the discussions, the participants were informed and agreed to the survey's purpose, participation requirements, topics to be discussed, research risks, confidentiality, and anonymity. In addition, prior to beginning the discussion verbal and written agreement to a consent form was completed and signed by the participants.

2.4 Limitations of the survey and comparisons to other data from Malawi

This survey is the first of its kind for refugee camps in Malawi, and as such functions as a baseline for programming and subsequent monitoring of changes over time. It has therefore been an objective to cover a wide range of topics to provide as much relevant information as possible and to investigate issues where we have little prior knowledge. This strategy also creates some challenges. For instance, the need for detailed information on the various livelihoods strategies chosen by different households means that some questions will only be asked to a handful of households, sometimes not sufficient in numbers to render statistical analysis meaningful.

A second challenge is that in order to accommodate the wide range of topics to be covered, some topics that would normally require a large set of questions had to be simplified. An example is poverty or consumption data. In this survey data has been collected on consumption levels, but in a much more simplified way than what is normal in a survey determining poverty levels in a country. Collecting comparable consumption data in order to measure poverty levels would require a survey on its own. This is outside the scope of this survey, and focus has been put on collecting simplified consumption data that can compare households within the survey. But this means that it is not possible to compare consumption data in this survey with poverty levels in official surveys conducted by the Malawi National Statistical Office.

Similarly, there are many ways to collect livelihoods information. The survey opted for a simplified version with focus on main livelihood activity, which makes it difficult to compare with results from other surveys, which may have used different definitions to capture livelihoods.

3.0 Demographic information

3.1 Registration groups and host communities

Demographic information for the refugees and asylum seekers was primarily collected through the Progress database (version IV) that UNHCR keeps on all people of concern in their camps. The verification of ProGress for Dzaleka was done in November to December 2016, and for Luwani in March 2017, completed 2 days before the field survey. Information on the host population was collected through the administered questionnaire.

Only Dzaleka camp shows the usual pattern with a majority of households being male-headed. All other locations have a slight majority of female-headed households. This could be explained through the fact that household heads in the camps are here understood as the person who is the main person in a registration group. There may thus be cases where a female is the main person the registration group because she arrived first or because the application is lodged through this individual.

Table 3.1: Sex of Household Head, Percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Female-headed | 28 | 56 | 68 | 54 |
| Male-headed | 72 | 44 | 32 | 46 |

3.2 Age structure

The average age of the household head is much lower in Dzaleka (both camp and host) than in Luwani. It may be expected that a camp population is younger than the host population, as younger members go to seek work. The survey did not observe this pattern. There are only minor differences in age of household head between host and camp populations within both locations.

Table 3.2: Average age of Household Head, years

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Average age | 36,6 | 34,2 | 43,2 | 42,2 |

The age structure of the sampled households had some interesting differences. In both camps approximately nine out of ten people are in the working age of 18-59 years of age. The remaining were either children or elderly. This contrasts to the host populations with a more even distribution. In both host communities, about three in ten are elderly (60 years or above), and a bit more than one in ten were children. Based on current population structure in Malawi, it is expected that there will be more children in host communities.

Table 3.3: Age distribution by age groups, percent

| Age group | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 0-17 years | 1 | 18 | 5 | 14 |
| 18-59 years | 92 | 52 | 89 | 57 |
| 60 + years | 7 | 30 | 6 | 29 |

3.3 Marital status

The data on marital status of household heads show some unexpected results. In either location there are few that are married⁶. In Dzaleka camp the proportion of married heads

⁶ ProGress data also showed a high number of single registration groups of 3197 prior to the survey.

stand at 53, but in both host communities only about one in 4 household heads are married. In both host communities about one in four are separated and the same proportion are widowed. There seems thus to be quite a presence of single-headed households. In Dzaleka camp, almost half are either single or widowed, with as much as 35 percent of household heads being single.

Table 3.4: Marital Status of Household Head*, Percent

| Status | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Host |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Divorced | 2 | 17 | 0 |
| Engaged | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Married | 53 | 25 | 23 |
| Separated | 1 | 25 | 23 |
| Single | 35 | 8 | 23 |
| Widowed | 10 | 25 | 23 |
| * No data collected for Luwani Camp | | | |

3.4 Nationality

The three main countries of origins in Dzaleka camp are Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Rwanda. As can be seen in the table below, DRC is the main group with 42 percent, followed by Burundi at 28 percent and Rwanda at 26 percent. There are individuals from other countries present in Dzaleka camp, but these make up only 4 percent of the household heads in the camp.

Table 3.5: Country of Origin of Household Head in Dzaleka Camp, Percent

| | Burundi | DRC | Rwanda | Others |
|------------|---------|-----|--------|--------|
| Proportion | 28 | 42 | 26 | 4 |

Asylum seeker is the most common status amongst household heads in Dzaleka camp. Three in five household heads have this legal status. The other main status is refugee, with almost two in five.

Table 3.6: Legal Status of Household Heads in Dzaleka Camp, percent

| Status | Dzaleka Camp |
|------------------|--------------|
| Asylum Seeker | 60 |
| Not of concern | 2 |
| Other of concern | 1 |
| Refugee | 37 |

The caseload for Luwani has not received clear status determination, because of the expectation that conflicts in Mozambique would cease. Several tripartite meetings of UNHCR, Government of Malawi (GoM) and Mozambique Government have been held to address the challenges. This is one key reason why the GoM has not rushed to address the refugee status determination.

3.5 Conclusions

A significant issue arising from the demographic data from ProGress is the high percentage (60) of persons of concern with undetermined refugee status. This implies that it is difficult for UNHCR to undertake long term planning for a population when they do not know whether they will be granted refugee status or refusal and whether they will be confined to camps as per the current legal arrangement. Advocacy on the right to work outside the camp will need higher-level engagement with the Government of Malawi authorities to speed up the refugee

status determination. This is key, given that the average age of nine out of 10 falls within the 18-59-year age group, presumed to be the productive range holding other variables constant.

In terms of programming, the UNHCR and partners have a huge challenge in determining what forms of development programming are relevant to nationalities with different cultural backgrounds, as will be explained in the livelihoods section. The DRC constitute the largest number of refugees and asylum seekers. ProGress data shows that the numbers have been consistent in terms of nationality. It should be noted that during the survey design, over 3,900 were single registration groups, and the majority were men. These also fall in the productive age range. This is a significant number that requires in-depth consideration for purposes of planning and programming.

Follow-up on the marital status of the host population is also required, given that there were high incidences of separation, which was equivalent in number to married status. This left questions on whether the camps have an impact on the high incidences of separation. The UNHCR and partners need to further investigate this matter. Promoting positive co-existence with the host population is at the core of UNHCR's work.

4.0 Household shelter and access to amenities

4.1 Context

This chapter looks at characteristics of the houses that refugee and host populations live in and access to various services linked to their dwellings. Housing conditions are often good indicators of general well-being, especially in a poor country such as Malawi. Access to amenities such as water, fuel and toilet facilities are also important indicators for both general well-being, but also indications of issues such as health and food security.

4.2 Characteristics of dwellings

Table 4.1 shows that almost all households in Luwani camp consider their dwelling of a semi-permanent nature. This contrasts to Dzaleka camp where about half of the households do the same. In Dzaleka camp there is also a considerable presence of traditional dwelling constructions (about 2 in 5 households), whereas one in ten are permanent. In both Dzaleka and Luwani host communities the mix of dwelling construction resembles Dzaleka camp, with approximately two of ten with permanent structure, four to five of ten are semi-permanent, and about four of ten are traditional.

Table 4.1: Type of general construction material of dwelling, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Permanent | 10 | 24 | 2 | 19 |
| Semi-Permanent | 48 | 40 | 96 | 45 |
| Traditional | 42 | 36 | 1 | 36 |

Ownership of dwellings centers around two types of ownership (table 4.2); households primarily either own their own dwelling or have authorized free access. In both host communities more than nine in ten households report owning the dwelling where they reside. In Luwani camp more or less half own their dwelling and the other half have authorized free access. In Dzaleka camp about three in four households own their dwelling, the remainder have primarily free authorized access.

Table 4.2: Ownership of dwelling, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Owned | 74 | 98 | 44 | 94 |
| Being purchased | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Employer provides | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Free authorized | 17 | 2 | 55 | 2 |
| Free, not authorized | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Rented | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

The material by which a dwelling is constructed indicates the general level of wealth available to the owners. For instance, a more solid structure made by either cement or burnt bricks will be more long-lasting and provide better protection than a dwelling made by grass or mud. The materials are expensive for the refugees and asylum seekers, which implies that those households are better off than households living in non-solid structures.

In the two host communities the walls in the dwellings are primarily made of either un-burnt or burnt mud bricks (table 4.3). In Dzaleka host community some walls are also made of mud or compacted earth. In Dzaleka camp almost seven of ten dwellings have walls made of un-burnt mud bricks, while the remainder are primarily made of burnt bricks or mud. In Dzaleka

camp, three of five dwellings have walls of un-burnt bricks, whereas about one in ten are made of mud and the same for burnt bricks. In Luwani camp about three in five have un-burnt mud bricks, whereas three in ten have reported “other” materials. These are primarily tents.

Table 4.3: Main material of outer walls of main dwelling, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Grass | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mud | 13 | 15 | 4 | 3 |
| Compacted earth | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Mud brick (Unfired) | 66 | 26 | 62 | 51 |
| Burnt bricks | 10 | 47 | 1 | 43 |
| Concrete | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Wood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Iron sheets | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 |

A good roof will keep the rain out during rainy season, whereas a cheaper roof may not provide sufficient protection for people and food stocks. The type of roof over people’s head may thus make a difference in their welfare.

In Dzaleka camp the primary roof material is grass (table 4.4), for approximately three out of four households. The remaining households have primarily iron sheets. In contrast, two out of three households in Luwani camp have iron sheets for roofing. In the two host communities, almost all households have either grass or iron sheets. It can be assumed that those households that can afford to put iron sheets on their roof have a higher welfare than their neighbours.

Table 4.4: Main material of roof of main dwelling, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Grass | 73 | 60 | 1 | 48 |
| Iron sheets | 22 | 39 | 67 | 52 |
| Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Plastic sheeting | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 |

4.3 Access to housing amenities and waste disposal

In terms of access to drinking water, boreholes are the main source across the four communities. More than eight in 10 households from all communities report using boreholes as their main source of drinking water (table 4.5). In Dzaleka there are some households using a public well (Dzaleka Host) and some use standpipe (both). In general, there is very little use of open, unsafe sources of water.

Table 4.5: Main source of drinking water, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| River/stream | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Rainwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Piped into yard/plot | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Communal standpipe | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Open public well | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Borehole | 91 | 79 | 94 | 95 |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|---|---|---|
| Spring | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|--------|---|---|---|---|

The main type of toilet in all communities is a traditional latrine with roof. Approximately seven or eight in ten households use this type of toilet. In addition, there is some use of traditional latrines without roof, especially in Luwani host community where three in ten households use this. There are generally few households reporting that they use the open-air bush for their toilet needs, a practice that is normally considered an unsafe practice that may spread disease.

Table 4.6: Main type of toilet facility, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Flush toilet | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| VIP latrine | 6 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Traditional latrine w/roof | 76 | 82 | 73 | 67 |
| Traditional latrine without roof | 14 | 16 | 6 | 30 |
| None (Open-air bush) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 9 | 2 |

For hygiene and other reasons, it would be ideal that each household have their own toilet facility and do not need to share this with many others. The majority of households in all communities have their own toilet facilities. However, about two in 10 households in Luwani (camp and host) and about three in 10 in Dzaleka (camp and host) share their toilet facilities with other households.

Table 4.7: Proportion of households who share toilet facilities with other households, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 30 | 36 | 23 | 22 |

4.4 Access to lighting facilities and energy for cooking

Batteries for torches are the main source of power for lighting in all areas. The use of batteries is most pronounced in the host communities, where almost eight in 10 households use this source of lighting. In Luwani camp the second most important power source for lighting are batteries charged with solar panels. In Dzaleka camp two in 10 households use candles. Thirteen percent of households in Dzaleka camp use electricity and there is also some access to electricity in Luwani host community (six percent). Both Dzaleka host community and Luwani camp have no access to electricity.

Table 4.8: Main source of lighting fuel, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Collected firewood | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| From solar (battery) panel | 11 | 11 | 30 | 1 |
| Purchased firewood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grass | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Paraffin | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Electricity | 13 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Battery/dry cell (torch) | 41 | 75 | 55 | 80 |
| Candles | 20 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Battery/dry cell (car) | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |

In terms of power for cooking, collected firewood is the most important source in both Luwani communities and in Dzaleka host community, with approximately nine out of 10 households using this source of fuel. In Dzaleka camp only three out of 10 report the same, whereas almost six in 10 use charcoal and one in 10 use purchased firewood. This indicates a more monetized access to cooking power in Dzaleka camp. Charcoal is most likely purchased in many instances. Across all communities there is a clear reliance on biomass from the surrounding area for cooking needs. Malawi has a generally high level of degradation of their forests and biomass. It may therefore be important to support the communities in question to come up with alternatives to biomass for their fuel needs.

Table 4.9: Main source of cooking fuel, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Collected firewood | 30 | 87 | 96 | 94 |
| Purchased firewood | 12 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Electricity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charcoal | 57 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| Crop residue saw dust | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Households were also asked if their current access to cooking fuel is sufficient to cover their cooking needs. A higher proportion of households reported have sufficient cooking fuel in Luwani. Households in Dzaleka camp are least satisfied with their cooking fuel, with 34 percent not having enough.

Table 4.10: Proportion of households who have access to sufficient cooking fuel to cover cooking needs, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 34 | 59 | 64 | 74 |

A few households have access to electricity for lighting and other needs. Dzaleka camp is the most connected area in terms of electricity, with 15 percent of the households having access to electricity from Electricity Supply Commission of Malawi (ESCOM)⁷. Six percent of households in Luwani host community also have access, whereas there is no access to electricity in Dzaleka host community and Luwani camp.

Table 4.11: Proportion of households who have access to electricity in their dwelling, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Across all communities, households are stating that baby care items and female dignity items are the ones they lack the most. In general, all hygiene items are more available in Dzaleka camp as compared to Luwani camp. There are no major differences between camp and host communities.

Table 4.12: Proportion of households with sufficient access to various personal hygiene items, percent

⁷ This is above the national average for Malawi, where 10% of the population is connected to ESCOM grid.

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Personal hygiene items | 65 | 58 | 43 | 67 |
| Cleaning/hygiene items | 56 | 50 | 43 | 62 |
| Female/dignity items | 30 | 35 | 39 | 40 |
| Baby care items | 15 | 19 | 15 | 26 |

4.5 Conclusion and program implications

There are few major differences between host and camp populations in housing and access to amenities. However, a few tentative conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in this chapter. Houses in host communities tend to be more solid than houses in the camps. Where a camp is planned to be a long-term residence for people, then one may look into bringing the housing structures in the camps up to the same standards as surrounding areas.

Most households in all areas are using water from boreholes. It could be beneficial to clarify whether these boreholes are generally producing safe drinking water. Similarly, there are few households using open-air bush as toilet. However, it could be looked into whether the traditional latrines used by most households are generally safe or if they could be improved upon in terms of hygienic safety.

There is a high reliance on biomass as fuel for cooking. Some households are also reporting lack of sufficient cooking fuel, indicating the need to address this situation. Malawi has a large problem with degradation of forests, and it should be explored if alternative sources of cooking fuel could be promoted as businesses (briquette making and marketing, commercial biogas, greater use of solar and exploring possibility of use of wind energy). Some of these projects require heavy investments and partnerships at a large scale with the private sector. Yet, it is the weakest point in the Malawi economy as it is relatively dependent on external investment resources that are most difficult to access. The competition for these resources makes it also difficult for UNHCR, as it has not been incorporated in national planning processes, and donor financing. Lobbying for inclusion of refugees in the Malawi United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) offers promise in the years ahead.

5 Humanitarian and Special needs

5.1 Humanitarian assistance

Almost all camp households and households in Luwani host community have received some form of humanitarian assistance in the last three months. Almost half of Dzaleka host community households have received the same. This is not surprising given that the survey took place at the tail end of one of the largest humanitarian food security interventions in recent years in Malawi, following a particularly bad year in terms of harvest.

Many households who have received UNHCR or WFP assistance have also received food assistance either through cash, vouchers or in-kind from other sources. In addition, quite a few have received health care assistance⁸. Approximately a quarter of the households in Dzaleka camp and almost half in Luwani camp have also received hygiene kits. Malawians in general receive food assistance through the joint programming of the World Food Programme and Government of Malawi with implementing partners such as World Vision. In Luwani, World Vision was providing food to the host communities.

Table 5.1: Proportion of households who have received various kinds of humanitarian assistance in the last 3 months, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Any kind of assistance | 99 | 46 | 97 | 95 |
| Food assistance in ecard/voucher | 72 | 0 | 71 | 58 |
| Food assistance in kind | 61 | 20 | 49 | 54 |
| Health care | 44 | 31 | 50 | 54 |
| Psychological support | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Hygiene kits | 25 | 1 | 43 | 1 |
| Other non-food items | 8 | 2 | 14 | 5 |

In terms of non-emergency support, Dzaleka host community stands out as having not received as much as the other groups. About a quarter in Dzaleka host community have received education support, and a few have received water services, otherwise few have received any support. Luwani camp households, on the other hand, have received a range of support. About half of the households in Luwani camp have received education support, shelter materials, furniture/clothes, water storage items, toilets, and non-food items. Households in Dzaleka camp have received more than the host communities, but less than households from Luwani camp.

Table 5.2: Proportion of households who have received various kinds of free assistance in the last 3 months, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Education support (services) | 42 | 23 | 54 | 61 |
| Donation of Shelter materials | 10 | 1 | 55 | 4 |
| Donation of furniture/clothes | 19 | 2 | 64 | 8 |
| Water storage items (tanks, containers, buckets) | 10 | 1 | 55 | 4 |
| Support water service connection / | 10 | 7 | 14 | 11 |
| Support and build (new or refreshed) latrines/ toilets/ | 2 | 2 | 48 | 1 |

⁸ In both Dzaleka and Luwani camps there is a health centre that provides free access and medication. At least 60% of health seekers are from host communities, which is why Dzaleka health centre was expanded. Serious cases are referred to Dowa Hospital and Kamuzu Central Hospital.

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|----|----|
| Receive cooking kits and non-food kits (blankets, etc.) | 10 | 1 | 50 | 10 |
| Receive legal support | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

5.2 Special needs and child labor

Households with members who are unable to contribute fully to the household, due to limitations such as disability and illnesses, often struggle more than others in making ends meet. They not only may have less able-bodied adults to contribute towards the household economy, they may also face an extra burden of caring for those with special needs. This chapter maps to which degree households in the surveyed areas are facing such challenges, and also to which degree children of school-going age are working instead of going to school.

5.2.1 Special needs

Approximately one in 10 households in all areas have a disabled member in their household. The same proportion applies for members having a serious medical condition. When it comes to chronic illness the proportion ranges between one and two per 10 households. About half of the households in all areas report having at least one member with a temporary illness such as malaria or diarrhea. There are no major differences between the four areas in any of these indicators.

Table 5.3: Proportion of households with presence of members with various special needs, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Disability | 12 | 15 | 10 | 12 |
| Chronic illness | 20 | 10 | 9 | 19 |
| Temporary illness | 46 | 54 | 44 | 45 |
| Serious medical condition | 14 | 8 | 12 | 8 |

It can sometimes be difficult to appropriately identify people with special needs. One proxy indicator for such needs is the requirement of assistance to use the toilet. However, as seen in table 5.4, there are very few households in either of the four areas that report having members with such needs.

Table 5.4: Proportion of households with presence of member who need assistance to use the toilet, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

5.2.2 Women's access to hygienic services

The UNHCR Malawi and partners have tried to provide sanitary pads to refugees. However, there are issues regarding whether the approach is suitable or not. In Luwani it was reported by women that most end up selling the sanitary pads to the surrounding villages. They pointed to the interviewer that she can visit the market and see that most of what they are given is then sold. They explained that they sold them because they were not a priority among their needs. This means that UNHCR and partners mean need to look for other options such as training and investing in sanitary pad production rather than procuring elsewhere so that it becomes a business for women.

In Dzaleka, women raised the issues of contraceptive drug supplies. Shortages are intermittent, there is therefore great need to review and improve supply of drugs at the health

facility. Participants indicated that most women in the camp are having an uncontrollable number of children because they do not practice family planning. They indicated that they are afraid of the health consequences that emanate from family planning such as; cancer, gaining weight uncontrollably, as well as bleeding non-stop for months among other side effects.

5.2.3 Children and work

Whereas almost all households in the host communities have children under the age of 18, approximately six in 10 households in Dzaleka camp have children, and eight in 10 households in Luwani camp.

Table 5.5: Proportion of households that have children under 18 years of age, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 64 | 90 | 77 | 95 |

Of those households with children, relatively few report that their child had been working during school hours in the last 30 days. Just over 10 percent in all areas report that their child has been working during school hours. Even if this is a relatively low figure, it is still cause for concern for the children in question. The main reason given for the child not attending school in the camps is that they work in services such as child mining, cooking, or restaurants/hotels. This reason is also frequently listed amongst the host communities, in addition to working in the agricultural sector.

Table 5.6: Proportion of households with children where a child worked during school hours in the last 30 days, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 11 | 14 | 12 | 16 |

5.3 Conclusion

The agriculture season of 2015 to 2016 was a particularly difficult one in terms of food supply at household level due to drought. Many families (over six million) needed government and donor support. The WFP ran into several problems on the supply chain, with constant brakes. The situation has improved in 2017, in the background of a better 2016-17 agricultural season. Planning around this current success is essential for WFP and UNHCR. Given that food security is a national issue, priority is usually tilted in favor of the local population. This means that UNHCR Malawi needs to be creative through long term investment in other economic activities so as to raise the incomes of persons of concern who depend on food rations.

There are few differences between the areas in the presence of household members with special needs. Approximately one in 10 households across all areas have a member who is disabled. We have not been able to look in detail as to who these household members are and what kind of disability they are affected by. However, it could be an area to look into whether such households, due to their need to care for disabled members, struggle more than others to devote sufficient time to their livelihoods activities. Child labour does not seem to be rampant, but as many as one in 10 households with children report that one of their children worked during school hours in the last 30 days. This could be an area of follow-up, in order to investigate the amount of work carried out by these children and to what extent it affects their schooling.

6.0 Livelihoods

6.1 Context

Designing livelihoods strategies to take existing and latent opportunities, especially of the camp population, was a major motivation for this survey. At the same time, understanding the challenges that inhibit exploitation of opportunities also needed to be known in the design of the livelihoods strategies. Many households in Dzaleka camp have stayed for an extended period of time, with some having been in the camp for decades since 1994. Some young people who have finished secondary education were born in the camp. The scope for them to return to their countries of origin is limited. It thus becomes a key question how they can become self-reliant through their own income-generating activities, rather than continue to rely on outside assistance. In Luwani the refugees have stayed for less time, mostly since March 2016, but it is important for UNHCR and partners to investigate what livelihoods opportunities are available to the camp and host population. There also seems to be issues related to access to land between the refugees and host communities, which needs attention from government.

Livelihoods are inherently difficult to capture in a survey. The main challenge is that people have different livelihoods, some linked to agriculture, some linked to other sectors, and some are self-employed whereas others are employed, formally or informally, by others. This creates problems when preparing questions in a small survey. Either questions have to be broad so that they apply to everyone, or the sample size has to be large as many questions will only be relevant to a sub-group of the sample. When only a small sub-group is responding to a question the statistical precision is reduced, often to the point that we cannot say anything with any statistical certainty. However, the following tables have been prepared with this in mind, and if one of the four population groups have had less than 30 households responding to a particular question, we have chosen not to present the figures.

6.2 Source of income: agriculture

6.2.1 Agriculture income

There are quite different livelihood patterns in the four surveyed areas. In Luwani host community about half of household heads are self-employed in agriculture for their income. Very few have established a livelihood in agriculture, but three out of 10 household heads are self-employed in non-agriculture. In Dzaleka, the host community is primarily engaged in agriculture.

6.2.2 Source of income: self-employment in agriculture

Some three of ten are self-employed in non-agriculture. About nine of 10 household heads state that self-employment in agriculture is their main livelihood. Even if the refugee population has been in Dzaleka for some time, only one in five household heads are self-employed in agriculture. A further two in five are self-employed in non-agriculture, thus making it the most important livelihood strategy.

Table 6.1: Households by employment status of household head, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Self-employed in agriculture | 19 | 88 | 2 | 52 |
| Self-employed in non-agriculture | 42 | 6 | 30 | 32 |
| Employed by someone else | 19 | 6 | 11 | 11 |
| Remittances | 18 | 1 | 56 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|
| Other | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|-------|---|---|---|---|

6.2.3 Source of income: remittances

In Luwani camp a bit more than half are relying on remittances, most of these remittances are coming from organizations. They thus consider reliance on assistance to be their main livelihood. Reliance on remittances in cash or support from organizations is still important in Dzaleka camp, as approximately 20 percent consider this their main livelihood (Table 6.1)

6.2.4 Source of income: employed by someone

The same proportion is employed by someone else. The respondents were also asked if any of their members were working or looking for work. For this question there are no major differences between the four areas, with between three to four in 10 households reporting that at least one of their members were looking for work.

Table 6.2: Proportion of households looking for work or employed by others

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Households with member either working or looking for work | 35 | 27 | 34 | 37 |
| Households with self-employed head who have household members employed by others | 9 | 10 | 0 | 4 |

As seen earlier, only a few household heads are employed by others. The most common status is to be self-employed, either in agriculture or in non-agriculture. Amongst those that are self-employed, very few are employing others in their businesses. In Dzaleka, approximately one in 10 self-employed heads of households are employing someone else in their business. In Luwani the figures are even lower. The majority of the jobs on offer are either casual or temporary. This strengthens the picture of a very limited labor market in the surveyed areas, especially in Luwani. In Dzaleka there are signs of some employment opportunities, but still at a very limited scale.

6.2.5 Employment type by nationality

Looking at the population in Dzaleka camp in particular, people from DRC are the least involved in agriculture. Almost half of households from DRC have self-employment in non-agriculture as their main livelihood. The highest engagement in agriculture is among the Rwandan population, with 33 percent (table 6.2). In the FGDs it was noted that the Rwandese and Burundians rented land outside the camp, and women were concerned that they were being displaced and becoming workers. The men tended to make the land rental arrangement with the refugees and monopolized the financial proceeds of such land rentals. They were open to equal benefits, if the arrangements were done in a transparent manner.

Table 6.3: Employment Status of household heads in Dzaleka Camp by country of origin, percent

| | Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|----------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|
| Self-employed in agriculture | 23 | 8 | 33 |
| Self-employed in non-agriculture | 34 | 47 | 35 |
| Employed by someone else | 23 | 17 | 17 |
| Remittances | 18 | 27 | 13 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 4 |

6.2.6 Sources of income and payment methods

A similar picture emerges when we look at the three main income sources for the households. In Luwani camp about half of the households say that support from organizations are their main livelihood, and seven out of 10 households say that they have no second source of income. In Luwani host community almost half have agriculture as their main income source, and a further quarter have manufacturing as their main income source. About half of households in Luwani host community have no second income source.

Dzaleka host community is clearly the most established community, with four in five having agriculture as the main income source, and with three in 10 households having more than two income sources. They are fairly reliant on agriculture, but significant proportions were saying that their second income source is wholesale and retail trade (15 percent) and other services such as restaurants, transportation, etc. (18 percent).

In Dzaleka camp, the picture is a bit more varied, with the main income sources being other services (26 percent), agriculture (22 percent) and wholesale and retail trade (16 percent). Although as many as 64 percent say they have no second source of income, an additional 10 percent say that they have other services as their second income source. In sum, Dzaleka camp seems to be a place where some trade is taking place and there seems to be some potential for setting up smaller businesses providing services or selling goods to other refugees or the host population.

Table 6.4: Proportion of households by sector of main income source, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Agriculture (cropping, livestock etc.) | 22 | 79 | 6 | 43 |
| Manufacturing (brick maker, charcoal maker) | 6 | 4 | 6 | 23 |
| Construction | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Wholesale and retail trade | 16 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| Other services (e.g. hotel, restaurant, transport, personal services such as cleaning, hair care, cooking and child care) | 26 | 6 | 12 | 16 |
| Remittance from relative | 7 | 0 | 10 | 3 |
| Remittance from other people or organizations | 13 | 2 | 46 | 2 |
| None | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 |

Table 6.5: Proportion of households by sector of second most important income source, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Agriculture (cropping, livestock etc.) | 5 | 11 | 1 | 15 |
| Manufacturing (brick maker, charcoal maker) | 2 | 8 | 4 | 5 |
| Construction | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Wholesale and retail trade | 4 | 15 | 2 | 1 |
| Other services (e.g. hotel, restaurant, transport, personal services such as cleaning, hair care, cooking and child care) | 10 | 18 | 3 | 8 |
| Remittance from relative | 6 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| Remittance from other people or organizations | 8 | 1 | 7 | 4 |
| None | 64 | 40 | 73 | 54 |

Table 6.6: Proportion of households having more than two income sources, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 14 | 31 | 13 | 16 |

Evidently, the livelihood patterns are different in the different target groups, with agriculture the mainstay in the established host communities, different types of small non-agricultural businesses in Dzaleka camp and fairly high reliance on support from organizations in Luwani camp.

The majority of employed household heads in Dzaleka camp were paid in cash. Only about one in 10 employed household heads were paid in-kind, although some were paid in a mix of cash and in-kind. There were less respondents in Luwani, but the same pattern emerged there, with cash being the main mode of payment.

Table 6.7: Proportion of employed households head by type of payment, percent

| | Cash | In-kind | mix |
|--|------|---------|-----|
| Dzaleka Camp | 58 | 12 | 29 |
| Dzaleka Host | - | - | - |
| Luwani Camp* | 75 | 8 | 17 |
| Luwani Host* | 82 | 0 | 18 |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | |

6.3 Access to land and water

6.3.1 Access to land for agriculture

Agriculture is still the mainstay livelihood activity in the established host communities, but a significant proportion of households in Dzaleka camp are also engaged in agriculture. There are thus some households engaging in agriculture who do not consider this their main income source. Almost all households in Dzaleka host community have cultivated some crops, compared to about three in 10 households in Dzaleka camp. In Luwani, almost four in five host community households have cultivated some crops, compared to only one in 10 amongst the refugees. An enumerator noted that many refugees appreciate the host community on how they make their land available for farming use of the refugees, whilst host community also appreciated the benefit of getting cheaper food bought from the refugees (24 March, 2017).

6.3.2 Access to irrigation water

Access to irrigated water for those that are self-employed in agriculture seems to vary by location. Almost half of such households in Dzaleka host community report having access to irrigated water, whereas less than a fifth of such households in Dzaleka camp report the same. Access to water for refugee households engaged in agriculture seems thus to be of importance. In Luwani host community about one quarter of agricultural households have access to irrigated water.

Table 6.8: Proportion of self-employed in agriculture who have access to irrigated water, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 16 | 46 | - | 24 |

6.4 Crop production trends

6.4.1 Types of crops grown

The types of crops people grow in the four areas are common. All have the largest proportion engaged in maize cultivation, with pulses as the second most important crop. Both host communities are also cultivating some vegetables and fruits, whereas roots are also important in Dzaleka host community. Table 6.9 shows that the proportions that have cultivated any crops during the 2015/16 season are slightly higher for all four areas compared to the proportion who have agriculture as their main livelihood activity.

Table 6.9: Proportion of households who have cultivated any crops in the 2015/16 season, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 28 | 97 | 11 | 76 |

Table 6.10: Proportion of households who cultivate various crops, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Maize | 25 | 96 | 10 | 75 |
| Roots | 3 | 31 | 3 | 6 |
| Pulses | 14 | 65 | 8 | 28 |
| Vegetables | 4 | 36 | 3 | 15 |
| Fruits | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 |

Households who had cultivated some crop in the last agricultural season were asked what the main source of their seeds was. In Dzaleka, both in the camp and host community, buying seeds on the market was the main way of accessing seeds. In the host community there was also some retention of seeds from the last season. In Luwani host community seeds for maize were also primarily bought. For other crops we have less data, but it seems to be that retention of seeds is also of importance in Luwani.

Table 6.11: Proportion of households who cultivated maize and pulses by source of seeds, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | | Dzaleka host | | Luwani Camp | | Luwani host | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | Maize | Pulses | Maize | Pulses | Maize* | Pulses* | Maize | Pulses* |
| Bought | 61 | 72 | 58 | 65 | 30 | 6 | 67 | 52 |
| Retained from last season | 30 | 21 | 39 | 32 | 52 | 88 | 29 | 37 |
| Both | 9 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 11 |

* Less than 30 respondents for this group.

Table 6.12: Proportion of households who cultivated roots and vegetables by source of seeds, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | | Dzaleka host | | Luwani Camp | | Luwani host | |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|------|
| | Roots* | Veg | Roots | Veg | Roots | Veg | Roots | Veg* |
| Bought | 91 | 77 | 37 | 87 | - | - | - | 27 |
| Retained from last season | 4 | 23 | 63 | 13 | - | - | - | 60 |
| Both | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 13 |

* Less than 30 respondents for this group.

6.4.2 Usage of fertilizer for crops grown

Crop-producing households were also asked if they used fertilizer and pesticide on their crops. When it comes to fertilizer, this is most commonly used for maize. In Dzaleka, a large majority of maize-producing households used fertilizers, with small differences between the host and refugee population. About half of households in Dzaleka growing vegetables also used fertilizer. In Luwani, the application of fertilizer is much lower for all crops. Forty percent of Luwani host households growing maize used fertilizer. For other crops amongst the Luwani host population and for all crops in Luwani Camp, few households use fertilizer.

Table 6.13: Proportion of households who cultivated various crops who used fertilizer, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Maize | 79 | 87 | 22* | 40 |
| Roots | 26* | 3 | 0* | 0* |
| Pulses | 10 | 7 | 0* | 7* |
| Vegetables | 46 | 62 | 0* | 13* |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | | |

6.4.3 Pesticide usage

When it comes to pesticide, we see that it is much less common to use this. Only for vegetables amongst both Dzaleka populations are there any significant use of pesticides, with approximately six out of 10 households. For all other crops where we have sufficient data, less than 10 percent use pesticide. It is unclear whether this is due to less need for this or if it is too costly for most households to apply this.

Table 6.14: Proportion of households who cultivated various crops who used pesticide, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Dzaleka Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Maize | 9 | 4 | 9* | 5 |
| Roots | 9* | 0* | - | - |
| Pulses | 6 | 2 | 0* | 4* |
| Vegetables | 57 | 58 | - | 0* |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | | |

6.4.4 Source of capital for agricultural inputs

An important aspect of agriculture from a programming perspective is access to inputs. The application of key inputs such as water, fertilizer and pesticide require capital. Crop-producing households were also asked how they sourced the necessary capital to purchase inputs. For the majority of crop-producing households across all areas sale of previous crops is the main source of capital for purchasing inputs. There is some reliance on donations from either individuals or organizations such as NGOs and UNHCR, but little reliance on donations from the government. There are few differences in terms of source of capital for the various crops.

Table 6.15: Proportion of households who cultivated maize and pulses by source of capital for all inputs, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | | Dzaleka host | | Luwani Camp | | Luwani host | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | Maize | Pulses | Maize | Pulses | Maize* | Pulses* | Maize | Pulses* |
| From crop sales | 66 | 78 | 82 | 90 | 57 | 71 | 67 | 59 |
| Donation from an individual | 13 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 11 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|
| Donated by an NGO or UNHCR | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 5 | 22 |
| Donated by Government | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| Contract from private sector | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Borrowed from local association | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| Remittances from relative | 5 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | | | | | | |

Table 6.15: Proportion of households who cultivated roots and vegetables by source of capital for all inputs, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | | Dzaleka host | | Luwani Camp | | Luwani host | |
|--|--------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|------|
| | Roots* | Veg | Roots | Veg | Roots | Veg | Roots | Veg* |
| From crop sales | 70 | 71 | 79 | 82 | - | - | - | 53 |
| Donation from an individual | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | - | - | - | 27 |
| Donated by an NGO or UNHCR | 13 | 3 | 0 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 |
| Donated by Government | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 7 |
| Contract from private sector | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |
| Borrowed from local association | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 |
| Remittances from relative | 9 | 9 | 11 | 13 | - | - | - | 13 |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | | | | | | |

6.4.5 Crop production output

Given the low sample size for the host communities and the fairly low level of agricultural production amongst the refugees, we have limited data on the amount of crops produced by the various groups. However, the data suggest that the level of production is much higher in the established Dzaleka host community than amongst the camp population. Maize-producing households in Dzaleka camp produced almost 300 kgs of maize compared to almost 1000 kgs in the host community. The only crop where the levels were similar is for vegetables, where households who grow this crop in both Dzaleka camp and host community have in excess of 400 kg. We can also say that the level of production seems to be much higher in Dzaleka as compared to Luwani for most crops. Although we have small amounts of data, there seems to be some households who have significant production of fruits in the Luwani host community.

Table 6.15: Average crop production by households who cultivated various crops, kg

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Maize | 288 | 988 | 284* | 159 |
| Pulses | 62 | 173 | 27* | 25* |
| Roots | 122* | 296 | - | - |
| Vegetables | 421 | 466 | - | 18* |
| Fruits | - | 63* | - | 259* |
| * Less than 30 respondents for this group. | | | | |

6.5 Livestock

Data on livestock rearing show a similar pattern to the data on crop production. The established host communities have a much higher engagement in this activity than the refugee populations, and Dzaleka seems to have a higher level of activity than Luwani.

Table 6.16: Proportion of households who own livestock

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 20 | 77 | 4 | 55 |

In Dzaleka camp, chicken are the most common livestock to rear with 13 percent doing so. There is also some rearing of goats and pigs (4 and 5 percent respectively, whereas cattle is very rare). In Luwani camp there is no reporting of any other livestock than chicken. In the host communities, it is more common to have chicken (about half in Dzaleka host and 35 percent in Luwani host). In these communities it is also fairly common to have goats (about one third of the households). Pig rearing is at approximately the same level in Dzaleka host community, whereas it is almost non-existent in Luwani host community. About one in 10 households in both host locations have cattle. There is a clear pattern that the traditional agricultural and livestock livelihoods activities are much more common in the established host communities than amongst the refugee population.

Table 6.17: Proportion of households who own various types of livestock, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Cattle | 1 | 10 | 0 | 12 |
| Pigs | 5 | 35 | 0 | 2 |
| Goats | 4 | 33 | 0 | 38 |
| Chicken | 13 | 48 | 3 | 35 |

6.6 Challenges in agriculture related livelihoods

An important aspect to map is what kind of challenges households face when conducting their livelihood activities. For households engaged in agriculture (the data is too small for Luwani camp), approximately four out of five households have faced some challenges when conducting their agricultural activities. There are few significant differences between the three groups compared, except Luwani host community seems to be harder hit by bad weather. The most important challenge across all groups is inadequate access to inputs. This is followed by inadequate access to credit, bad weather and inadequate access to land (especially for the camp population).

Table 6.18: Proportion of households engaged in agriculture who faced various challenges in conducting their agricultural activities in the last 3 months, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Any challenges | 78 | 77 | 86 |
| Inadequate access to land | 24 | 6 | 20 |
| Inadequate access to irrigated water | 8 | 5 | 8 |
| Inadequate access to inputs | 52 | 46 | 62 |
| Inadequate access to extension workers | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Bad weather | 16 | 24 | 66 |
| Inadequate access to credit | 22 | 18 | 30 |
| Inadequate access to seasonal workers | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Own illness | 3 | 6 | 6 |

6.7 Non-agricultural livelihoods activities

6.7.1 Types of non-agricultural activities

Non-agricultural activities are most common in Dzaleka camp, followed by both Luwani communities. Dzaleka host community has few heads of households engaged in non-agricultural activities. For the kind of non-agricultural activities most households are engaged with in Dzaleka camp, a small shop/workshop or petty trading business is the most common.

In both Luwani communities it seems that having a small business selling firewood/charcoal or other homemade handicraft is the most common. What we can clearly see is that very few are engaged in more advanced activities that require some capital such as offering transportation, computer services, restaurant services, etc. Most activities are concentrated around types of businesses that require minimal capital investment and also skills.

Table 6.19: Households by engagement in various non-agricultural livelihoods activities, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Do your household have/own a business or service from home or a household-owned shop, as a carwash owner, metal worker, mechanics carpenter, tailor, barber, etc.? | 11 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Do your household process and sell any agricultural by-product, including flour, starch, juices, beer, jam, oil, seed, bran, etc. but excluding livestock by-products, fresh/processed fish? | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Do your household have/own a trade business on a street or in a market selling clothes, utensils, and trinkets? | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Do your household have/own a business that offer any services or sell products such as firewood, home-made charcoal, curios, construction timber, wood poles, traditional medicines, mats, bricks, cane furniture, weave baskets, thatch grass, etc. | 6 | 7 | 9 | 23 |
| Do your household have/own a business that provides a professional office or offer professional services from home as a doctor, accountant, lawyer, private tutor, midwife, mason, etc. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Do your household drive a household-owned taxi or pick-up to provide transportation or moving services | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Do your household have/own a business in the form of a bar or restaurant | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Do your household have/own a business at home or own a street offering computer software, phone repairs? | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

6.7.2 Challenges in non-agricultural businesses

Households indicated the extent of challenges experienced in conducting their non-agricultural business activities. The most important challenge is lack of cash. This applies to all areas. This is followed by inadequate access to office space, inadequate access to inputs and erratic markets. There are no major differences between the various areas in terms of the business challenges they face, but inadequate access to credit seems to also play a role in Luwani.

Table 6.20: Proportion of households facing challenges with conducting their business by type of challenge, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Inadequate access to office space | 21 | 14 | 19 | 12 |
| Inadequate access to affordable utilities | 8 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Inadequate access to inputs | 17 | 19 | 14 | 14 |
| Erratic markets | 16 | 8 | 8 | 26 |
| Inability to travel outside the camp | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Lack of cash | 64 | 56 | 76 | 74 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Inadequate access to credit | 8 | 0 | 17 | 21 |
| Illness | 11 | 17 | 8 | 7 |

6.7.3 Challenges in finding employment

The main challenge that households are facing when trying to access work is that employment is not available. This is very clear for all areas. Lack of jobs is thus a key challenge for many. Issues related to lack of work permits and inability to travel seems to be of lesser importance to people across both locations. In the FGDs in Dzaleka women elaborated on the work challenges they had. They indicated that the camp provided opportunities for informal jobs (ganyu), which was not the same as Luwani. The women reported that the main sources of livelihoods in the community are ganyu (casual labour in the refugee camp, including washing for the refugees, drawing water as well as carrying items that refugees receive including foods as porters), farming, buying and selling of agricultural produce as well as running small businesses as in hawkers. For the ganyu, the women reported that all age categories and genders engage in the activity as it is an important source of income for the community especially when the incomes from agriculture are not available.

Table 6.21: Proportion of households facing challenges with accessing work by type of challenge, percent

| Challenge | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host* | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host* |
|---|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Employment is unavailable | 87 | 96 | 94 | 96 |
| Inability to travel outside of community | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| No work permit | 8 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Own-illness/needs to care for household members | 10 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

* Less than 30 respondents for this group.

The competition for the informal jobs is very intense in the camp, as refugees and asylum seekers attempt to complement the aid they receive from UNHCR and partners. A key matter that has consistently arisen is that of sex work and the extent to which it happens across the 4 survey sites (example in box 6.1). The FGDs focused on this matter and found that there is a mixed reaction to it. There are difficulties in establishing the facts, in that sex work issues when raised in vulnerable communities can be hard to decipher, as the participants may raise it as a matter to attract aid, and in the process may hide the realities among the households. Therefore, the FGDs helped in picking stories around sex work.

Box 6.1: Sex work in the camps

Young women in the camp generating income through sex were estimated to be 90%. This has resulted in early child bearing and dropping out of school. One of the women failed to hold on to her tears when she narrated how her 15 year daughter left home and started sex work. In her words "my daughter left at a very young age of 13 and now she is 15 to start sex work, I tried as a mother to pump some sense in her but her response was how will I survive without food and some basic needs? My friends laugh at me and there is an opportunity I can use to make money", and then she left the household. The mother has now abandoned the girl and with tears in her eyes she said she does not count her as a daughter anymore. They were allegations that some of the young also slept with their mother's boyfriends for money. Sex work by the young was attributed to the failure of parents to provide basic needs to the young girls.

Source: FGD with women in Dzaleka Camp

The youth in Dzaleka camp were of the view that sex work was often exaggerated. They approximated that between 30-40 percent of girls in the camp engage in sex in exchange for

cash and other things. They reported that the girls tend to go out with wealthy men, which is “normal” in any society where there is endemic poverty. According to the young men and women, there were no differences in engaging in sex work by nationalities. They noted that in the majority of cases the girls engage in prostitution in order to be able to afford to purchase luxuries like quality clothes and phones. Providing income earning opportunities, as well as capital was suggested as a solution to end sex work out of desperation or for purchasing luxuries.

6.8 Skills training related to livelihoods

All households were also asked if they have attended any skills training in the last six months. Overall, few households have attended such training, although it seems such trainings have been more available in Dzaleka. In Dzaleka camp 11 percent of the households reported having attended skills training, compared to five percent in the Dzaleka host community.

Table 6.22: Proportion of households who have attended skills training, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 11 | 5 | 1 | 2 |

6.9 Savings and access to financial services

The selling of rations to meet other needs was quite common in Dzaleka camp. Given that some confirmed that they worked outside or had “enough” from their businesses implied that they did not necessarily need to be on the food ration list. An interviewer (24 March 2017) in Dzaleka, noted that “most of the refugees rely on selling the ration food, to get some cash to meet other parcel needs. They pile the ration food given and sell so that they raise a capital for business or they get money to lend the farming land from the host community”. On the other hand, memberships in cooperatives, association or social groups are clearly most common in the established host communities. More than nine in 10 households in both camps state that they are not members of such groups. This contrast to both host communities were approximately four in 10 are members of a savings group such as Village Savings and Loans. It is unclear why such groups have not been established in the camps.

Table 6.23: Proportion of households who are members of cooperatives, association or social group, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, savings group, such as a tontine, rotating organization of savings and credit association (ROSCA) or village savings and loans (VSL) | 2 | 44 | 0 | 36 |
| Yes, cooperative or association of individuals working together | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| Yes, social group (e.g. related to religion, community) | 5 | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| Used Airtel or Mpamba Money | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No | 91 | 47 | 96 | 45 |

The proportion of households who did not save or invest any money in the last 12 months is highest in Luwani camp, with nine out of 10 households not doing so. There is in general little evidence of investments, but some saving is being recorded. The highest proportion of households who saved was found in Dzaleka host community with 28 percent, followed by 22 percent in Luwani host community.

Table 6.24: Proportion of households who saved money or invested in the last 12 months, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, I saved money | 9 | 28 | 5 | 22 |
| Yes, I bought assets with my savings | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| Yes, I bought assets with my savings and saved money | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Did not have any savings | 9 | 13 | 4 | 3 |
| Used Airtel or Mpamba Money | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No, I did not save or invest | 74 | 52 | 91 | 65 |

Households were also asked if they currently have any savings in various forms. Very few have any such savings amongst both camp populations. Also, less than half of both host populations report having savings. However, community banking seems to play a role in the host communities, with between two and three of 10 households reporting to have savings in a community banking mechanism.

Table 6.25: Proportion of households who currently have money saved in various forms, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, I have savings in a bank | 4 | 8 | 0 | 6 |
| Yes, I have savings in a community banking mechanism (savings group, tontine, ROSCA, VSLA, etc.) | 1 | 23 | 0 | 31 |
| Yes, I have savings at home (either in money or in the form of assets) | 8 | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| Used Airtel or Mpamba Money | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| No savings | 85 | 62 | 95 | 59 |

When it comes to the possibility of saving if households had anything to save, the picture seems fairly positive. It varies from location to location, but between three and five households out of 10 say that they could save in a commercial bank. There is clearly a higher potential use of community banking mechanisms in the host communities, with very few refugee households stating that they could save in such a way. Refugee households seem to a larger degree to rely on saving at home. There seems thus to be a role to play for community banking structures in the camp settings, especially in Dzaleka camp where households tend to stay longer and the conditions are thus more stable.

Table 6.26: Proportion of households who report possibility of saving, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, I could save in a bank | 45 | 55 | 30 | 40 |
| Yes, I could use a community banking mechanism (savings group, tontine, ROSCA, VSL, etc.) | 3 | 22 | 7 | 37 |
| Yes, I could save at home | 28 | 11 | 42 | 11 |
| Save with Airtel or Mpamba Money | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| No | 18 | 12 | 14 | 5 |

It can be difficult to interpret whether an incurred debt is a sign of stress or a sign of investments and positive risk-taking. Borrowing money for consumption would be considered negatively, whereas it sometimes is necessary and positive to borrow money for investments related to income-generating activities. Overall, few households in all locations currently have

incurred debt. Mirroring previous information on access to financial services, we see that households in the camp tend to borrow from friends and family when in need of extra funds, whereas the host communities primarily rely on community banking. This underpins the need to look into establishing community banking in the camps.

Table 6.27: Proportion of households who currently have some incurred debt, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, I have borrowed funds from a formal bank | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Yes, I have borrowed funds through community banking | 0 | 14 | 0 | 18 |
| Yes, I have bought household items on credit and owe a person or a store | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Yes, I have borrowed from friends or family | 19 | 8 | 8 | 10 |
| Yes, I have borrowed from other sources | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| No | 77 | 75 | 89 | 68 |

6.10 Conclusion

A key finding of this survey is that livelihood patterns are quite different in the different surveyed areas. In Luwani host community most are self-employed, either in agriculture or non-agriculture. Households in Luwani camp have not yet established their livelihoods and are still relying on assistance. They may also be planning to return to Mozambique in the near future and thus may not have much incentive to set up a livelihood in the camp. In Dzaleka host community nine of 10 households are engaged in agriculture, mirroring a traditional situation in a Malawian village. In Dzaleka camp, however, the livelihoods pattern is more varied, with both agriculture and non-agriculture, in addition to support from outside. It should be noted that only as many as one in five households there say that self-employment in agriculture is their main livelihood activity.

This has relevance for what type of livelihood support can be envisaged. In Luwani camp, the livelihood support would have to be short-term as households are looking to return to Mozambique. In Dzaleka, a well-established camp, a more long-term strategy should be devised. Even if a relatively small proportion of the households are engaged in agriculture, it could be explored what the key factors are that prevent households from engaging in agriculture. Data on non-agricultural activities show that only low-technological strategies are currently followed, with little opportunities for further expansion. In such a situation it may be better to explore opportunities in agriculture and possibly more advanced non-agricultural activities.

The data is also pointing to an undeveloped labor market in the camp areas, especially in Luwani. There are people stating that they are looking for work, but there are few self-employed heads of households who employ others. There are also few who are employed by someone as their main livelihood. There are thus probably not many jobs available for camp households to seek out. Such jobs will have to be created, but this will probably require a long-term plan in collaboration with the Government. Some petty trade and low level smaller business activity is taking place in Dzaleka camp, but the data indicates that the markets are small making it harder to find sufficient clients for whatever service is being provided.

The agricultural data indicates that agricultural households in Dzaleka are doing much better than in Luwani. This is most likely due to climactic reasons as Dzaleka is situated in a better agricultural region. However, accessing sufficient capital for seasonal investments is a challenge for everyone. Host communities have some involvement in community banking, but this seems to be lacking in the camps. It should be explored if such community banking structures could be established also within the camps.

7.0 Poverty, vulnerability and food security

7.1 Poverty and food insecurity

Poverty is widespread in Malawi, the official data from the National Statistical Office putting the poverty rate at 50 percent from the last survey in 2010. The poverty level has been persistently high over the last decade, with only marginal decreases. New data will be released later in 2017 with the hope that the poverty level has subsided somewhat. Food insecurity due to bad harvests is a recurring theme in Malawi, with emergency relief aid being provided to the most vulnerable on an annual basis. The last harvest, the 2015/16 season, was particularly bad, and the relief aid reached levels never seen before. This forms an important context to the current survey, given that the data collection period was at the end of this emergency cycle, with peak food insecurity. We can therefore expect high proportions of households having received food security assistance (either cash or in kind) and also relatively high levels of food insecurity.

7.2 Poverty and consumption

It is difficult to ascertain the exact level of poverty through a small-scale household survey, as we did not have a correct poverty line at the time of data collection. These poverty lines are established through large-scale household surveys conducted every five years in Malawi. With the fluctuating inflation and changes in consumption patterns it is very difficult to compare expenditure data from a survey such as this one with expenditure data from a survey such as the Integrated Household Survey. However, what can be done is to compare expenditure levels between groups within the survey.

Table 7.1 shows clearly that the highest level of expenditure is in Dzaleka camp, with just over MK40,000 per month. The two host communities follow and Luwani camp has the lowest level of consumption with approximately MK25,000 per month. Luwani camp is also the location where the largest proportion is spent on food. The level spent on food is relatively high in all areas, indicating that most households do not have much money to spend on non-essential goods.

Table 7.1: Total monthly expenditure and proportion of expenditure going to food, kwacha and percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total expenditure | 41 472 | 27 270 | 24 459 | 35 312 |
| Proportion spend on food | 73 | 63 | 85 | 83 |

At Dzaleka camp, the Rwandan population stand out with significantly higher levels of consumption than the populations from Burundi and DRC. The Rwandan population also spends significantly less of their funds on food. This indicates that Rwandans are doing better, and it may be worth looking into whether this group needs less support, at least in terms of food and other consumption items.

Table 7.2: Total monthly expenditure and proportion of expenditure going to food for households in Dzaleka camp by country of origin, kwacha and percent

| | Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|--------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Total expenditure | 37 686 | 36 840 | 51 004 |
| Proportion spend on food | 78 | 85 | 58 |

Households were also asked how many assets they owned out of a list of 20. The number of assets owned mirror the level of consumption, in that Dzaleka camp has the highest average number of assets and Luwani camp has the lowest. This underlines the findings that households in Luwani camp have the highest need in terms of consumption levels. The welfare patterns are also repeated for Dzaleka camp, in that the Rwandan population clearly has a higher number of assets owned than others.

Table 7.3: Average number of assets owned by survey site

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 6,1 | 5,9 | 4,5 | 5,7 |

Table 7.4: Average number of assets owned by country of origin

| Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|---------|-----|--------|
| 5,7 | 6,0 | 7,5 |

7.3 Food insecurity

Food security is often measured by the food consumption score. This is a proxy indicator for food security, measuring the frequency that various food groups have been consumed by a household over a 7-day period. The cut-offs used in the table below follow WFP standards. If we look at the proportion of households falling in the low food consumption score group, this is clearly highest in Luwani camp with half of the households falling in this category. The host community in Luwani seems to be doing better with only one out of five households in the same category. In Dzaleka there are small differences between refugee and host population, at approximately a quarter of the households. The Luwani camp seems to clearly be the main area of concern, underlined by the fact that only five percent of the households have adequate food consumption score, compared to approximately 30 percent in the other areas.

Table 7.5 Proportion of households by Food Security Status, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Low Food Consumption Score (<21) | 25 | 28 | 50 | 19 |
| Moderate Food Consumption Score (21-35) | 43 | 45 | 46 | 49 |
| Adequate Food Consumption Score (>35) | 31 | 28 | 5 | 32 |

The population in Dzaleka camp shows small differences in terms of food security status between the three main population groups. People from Rwanda seem to be in a better position than most people from Burundi, who are faring worse than the average.

Table 7.6: Food Security Status of households in Dzaleka Camp by country of origin, percent

| | Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|----------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|
| Food insecure (<21) | 32 | 22 | 28 |
| Moderately food insecure (21-35) | 41 | 53 | 34 |
| Food Secure (>35) | 26 | 25 | 38 |

The number of meals a household has per day is an indicator of the frequency and perhaps also the quantity of food consumed. We can see that there are small differences between the areas, with Dzaleka camp having the lowest average number of meals per day. Interestingly,

Luwani camp does not score lowest here even if their food consumption score is significantly lower than for the other areas. There is no group where children eat less often than adults.

Table 7.7: Average number of meals per day

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Adults | 1,8 | 2,2 | 2,0 | 2,2 |
| Children | 1,9 | 2,5 | 2,2 | 2,5 |

Households had no large differences between the four groups in terms of food prioritization, with a large majority of households stating that in times of scarcity all have equal access or children gets prioritized. However, in Dzaleka camp, one in 10 households state that adult males are prioritized, perhaps indicating their reliance on adult males for income generation.

Table 7.8: Prioritized members of households for eating when food is scarce, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Equal access | 57 | 62 | 62 | 54 |
| Children | 29 | 38 | 31 | 44 |
| Elders | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adult male | 11 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Adult female | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

Approximately nine out of 10 households in each group say that they are able to cook food at least once a day. For those that are not able to cook at least once a day, the most cited reason is that they did not have any food to cook that day.

Table 7.9: Proportion of households who are able to cook food at least once a day, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 91 | 96 | 87 | 97 |

7.4 Coping adaptations when lacking food

In the face of food scarcity households may resort to various coping mechanisms such as eating less food, eating less preferred food, selling off assets, etc. The table below shows that the highest proportion of households who resorted to coping mechanisms in the face of food scarcity was in Luwani camp, with 86 percent. The lowest proportion was found in Dzaleka host community with 67 percent.

Table 7.10: Proportion of households that used coping strategies due to lack of food in the last 30 days, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 78 | 67 | 86 | 76 |

A coping strategy index was also compiled, looking at frequency and severity of coping (reduced Coping Strategy Index). The highest level of high coping was found, again, in Luwani camp with 73 percent and in Dzaleka camp with 74 percent. However, all areas showed high levels of coping mechanisms being applied, with the lowest proportion of high coping being found in Dzaleka host community with 59 percent. This may be a reflection of the humanitarian crisis that Malawi was still in the midst of at the time of data collection.

Table 7.11: Proportion of households by level of coping stress, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| No coping | 17 | 26 | 19 | 21 |
| Medium coping (1-3) | 8 | 14 | 8 | 12 |
| High coping (>4) | 74 | 59 | 73 | 67 |

7.5 Conclusion

The population in Luwani camp has the lowest level of consumption and asset ownership and has the highest need of assistance. The Dzaleka camp population is doing better, in particular the Rwandan population. These may be more self-reliant and thus need less assistance. The population in Luwani camp is very vulnerable to food insecurity and need to be assisted with food. Given that very few households in Luwani camp seem to have adequate food consumption, blanket distribution should be continued.

There are also food insecure households in Dzaleka camp, but the proportions are lower, especially amongst people from Rwanda. Other data from the nutrition survey should be triangulated to come up with an appropriate targeting and ration size strategy.

8.0 Safety and security

8.1 Security incidences

Safety and security is always of primary concern in a refugee camp setting. People have for various reasons moved from their home country to another, and may not have ended up in their preferred location. In a camp situation they are housed in relatively crowded conditions together with people from countries and cultures that they may not be familiar with. Provision of safety and security, especially for vulnerable groups such as women, becomes a key concern.

The survey asked households if they had experienced any kind of security related incidence in the last three months. There seems to be a higher level of such incidences in Dzaleka, especially within the camp. Almost three in 10 households in Dzaleka camp have experienced a security incidence in the last three months, compared to less than one in 10 in both Luwani camp and host community. In terms of differences between country of origin groups within Dzaleka camp, households from Burundi report the highest level of security incidences with 36 percent.

Table 8.1: Proportion of households who have experienced any kind of security incidence in the last 3 months, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 27 | 14 | 7 | 5 |

Table 8.2: Proportion of households in Dzaleka Camp who have experienced any kind of security incidence in the last 3 months by country of origin, percent

| Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|---------|-----|--------|
| 36 | 24 | 29 |

However, the security incidences experienced are of a less serious nature. There have been very few reports of kidnappings and extortions. The two most common security incidences are harassment and theft, as seen in table 8.3.

Table 8.3: Type of security issue experienced by households in the last 3 months, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Harassment | 16 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Theft | 9 | 9 | 3 | 5 |

There was no clarity on who is targeted for harassment and why. More immersion anthropological style data collection could shed some light. Through qualitative approaches the HSELA found that some elderly people were sometimes harassed. An enumerator (22 March 2017) found a case of an elderly person who had been accused of being a witch and subjected to all kinds of social ostracism with implications for access to services (Box 8.1).

Box: A case of Social exclusion

A 79-year-old man in one of the zones was concerned with his security in the camp. He said that since he is old and stays alone, people think that he is a witch, therefore there have been cases whereby people broke into his house and stole his belongings and threatened to kill him. So, he does not feel safe in the camp and he needs protection. He is usually ignored, and when he is unwell and faces difficulties in accessing rations from the central point. While other young people help elders, because of the accusations of witchcraft they at times do not want to help. He has had to rely on begging from either friends or strangers because he has

not found ways of making money in the camp. He said sometimes he even stands on the road to beg from the cars that pass by.

Source: Diary notes from Enumerator, 22 March 2017.

8.2 Movement during the day

Households were also asked whether any of their members had experienced reduced free movement during daytime due to lack of safety. There seems to be a slightly higher feeling of insecurity related to free movement in Dzaleka, especially in the camp where three of 10 households have members who have experienced this. Looking at Dzaleka camp in particular, there are few differences between the three common country of origin groups, only with a slightly lower level of insecurity amongst the population from Rwanda.

Table 8.4: Proportion of households who reported reduced free movement during daytime due to lack of safety, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 31 | 27 | 15 | 22 |

Table 8.5: Proportion of households in Dzaleka Camp who reported reduced free movement by any household member during day time due to lack of safety by country of origin, percent

| Burundi | DRC | Rwanda |
|---------|-----|--------|
| 31 | 32 | 24 |

Several cases were recorded by enumerators around movement in the camp during day and night. There was no major difference as the quantitative data shows (table 8.4 and 8.5). In the diaries, respondents raised concern of personal security. Most of them said they do not feel safe in the camp. One respondent felt that people from his country were after him, because some strange people come in the camp asking about him. There was once an incident whereby a person was killed and placed on his doorstep. The Rwandan refugees felt more insecure, because they said they are pursued even in the camp.

A Rwandan respondent indicated on 22 March that some unknown people had followed him and threatened his life. He has a scar on his head that he got from a car accident from once fleeing from the unknown people. A Rwandan lady who is a businesswoman with a thriving shop complained of the security situation. Before coming to Malawi, her husband was killed in Rwanda and she was shot in the arm, which is visible. She used to live in Lilongwe, but she suspected that the people who shot her husband followed her and she decided to come to the camp to be secure. She still lives in fear that one day these people might find her and kill her, and has put massive security measures on her compound through barricades and hardly moves around the camp during day and night.

8.3 Relationships with host communities

There are few indications of high tensions between camp and host communities in both locations. The lowest proportion of households considering the relationship between camp and host populations to be either very good or good is found in Luwani camp and in Dzaleka host community, where approximately seven out of 10 households consider the relationship very good or good.

Table 8.6: Proportion of households who reported either a very good or good relationship between camp and host communities, percent

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 93 | 74 | 68 | 91 |

In Dzaleka, women reported that there are approximately 50% intermarriages between nationalities as well as even marriages with the Malawian communities. This tended to bring stability and positive co-existence. However, issues of inheritance upon the death of a spouse was a source of tension, which at times could be nationalistic and anti-refugee. In often cases, children and the remaining spouse inherits the property however there are livelihood implications. If the person that passed on was active and working or doing business that was earning money to the household the remaining family suffers if they fail to continue with what that person was doing. This was more often with families that relied on technical expertise of one individual.

In the FGDs, the youth in Luwani camp lamented that the relationship between the refugees and surrounding host communities is not good and gave the following examples. Areas of difference related to sharing grazing areas; social treatment at school; and children from the camp being denied access to porridge that host community children receive. The poor relations between social service providers in health and education and refugee and asylum seeker clients were raised in other groups. Participants further indicated that conflicts with the Malawian communities are arising over natural resources (access to water, access to firewood, and access to wild fruits). These conflicts were intense in Dzaleka given the high population needing such resources for their living.

8.4 Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV) issues

The qualitative survey explored whether SGBV was a common phenomenon in the camp. This is a controversial subject and not easy to detect with short term surveys of this nature. SGBV, requires much longer studies, using social anthropological approaches to inform the quantitative data that may be collected. In this case a decision was made to put the questions in the qualitative tool. Yet, the short duration makes it difficult to be conclusive in the analysis of the results of the dialogue discussions. In addition, the selection of participants also requires time, should be balanced to avoid the community “speakers”, and must be inclusive. Yet, one to one sessions would also have been useful in ensuring privacy.

Given the above context, the results from the qualitative survey must be read with caution with a specific recommendation that UNHCR commission a longer-term study on SGBV. Violence against women was done by elderly men in Dzaleka (both host and in camp) as part of their socio-cultural life. They also realized from the awareness raising matters by organizations that it was a human rights abuse, but the awareness has not been effective across all genders. In Luwani, there was a 50:50 balance in men to women (and the opposite) violence. Mozambican women, had learnt the art of self-defense, and did not report the cases to any organisation.

Women participants indicated that SGBV and domestic violence are on the high side. 70% are beaten and 80% are yelled at however the women refuse to report the incidences to the police in fear that they will be severely beaten when they return to Mozambique. Others indicated that they are sexually abused in terms of rape in their marriages however this is kept as a secret to many in fear of getting embarrassed. Very few people (reportedly only 4 in the entire camp) practice prostitution as a survival strategy. However other exchange sex for food but

this is done in secrecy. Those that are in need of psychosocial counselling are assisted by a partner in the camp.

In Luwani, the youth noted rated SGBV as standing at three out of 10 in the camp. However, the youth noted that there is too much sexual violence for young girls, if they do not have strong families to protect them. They estimated that around six out of 10 girls and women are subjected to sexual violence, with rape being common. In the Luwani host men's group they rated that three out of 10 were single/widows, one out of 10 married women and four out of 10 girls were involved in sex for work. The men in Dzaleka reported that domestic violence is prevalent in the area, but that it is taken as cultural. An elderly man in the group said that battering a wife is a cultural way of telling her that she behaved wrongly toward the husband. They noted, however, that the issues are less prevalent now than before.

They further reported that issues of sex in exchange for things is prevalent in the area. They said that female-headed households and separated women are the ones mostly exchanging sex for various things. They said that the women engage in the behavior largely due to poverty. They, however, noted that some married women also engage in the same. However, the Dzaleka youth had a different observation. It was reported that issues of gender-based violence are not common in the community, except for occasional cases of yelling and shouting between spouses. The youth reported that, for example, they have never heard about any cases of rape in the area. They reasoned that either there are no rapes in their community or if people get raped, they conceal the incidences well. The interpretation of rape was also noted to be contextual, when the tendency of men in the surrounding communities was to abandon their families and marry refugee women whenever the men earn money from tobacco sales. The youth reported that the men return to their households once they have exhausted the money with the refugees in the camp.

In some cases, they attributed sex for work to the isolation and nightlife dominated by consumption of alcohol and substance use. This ended up contributing to cases of spousal violence over petty issues. In Luwani the camp management and UNHCR made a decision to ban alcohol-making and sales in the vicinity of residential areas, according to the Field Officer. In most of the rape cases, these were exclusively carried out outside the houses, especially as girl walk in bushy areas as they go to or from gardens, for example. A young man made a confession saying that he was once convinced by an Ethiopian man to "rent out" his girlfriend to the man for MK20,000. He proudly said that they shared 50% each with the girl and that they did not see anything wrong with the arrangement, as they needed the money. The victims of sexual and other forms of violence receive psychosocial support in the camp. A boy and a girl who participated in the FGD confirmed this, saying they are members of a psychosocial committee in the camp.

8.5 Conclusion

Dzaleka camp has the highest level of security incidences. However, the types of incidences are not of the most serious kind. The root causes of these incidences are not known. Jointly with the Government of Malawi, it should be explored whether increasing security or policing would be an appropriate response to address these concerns. What is clear is that solutions should not be confined to physical tools, but to greater conversations between the refugees, asylum seekers and the host communities. A combination of approaches is necessary. While enhancing livelihoods, building water sources, roads, and replanting trees may be the physical attributes of dealing with the tensions, more work of a non-physical nature is required.

In Luwani, all groups noted the need to remedy the bitter relationship between the two sides. The youth said that to minimize conflicts practical projects are an answer and the camp cannot over develop, while the host communities remain poor without assets. This is a key source of tension. Furthermore, they suggested that there is a need for intentional integration efforts like holding joint religious prayers to allow the two groups of people to learn from each other's cultures. The youth also said that in order to expose the refugees to the Malawian culture more, meetings between the refugees and Malawian should not only take place in the refugee camp but that meetings should also be held in the host communities.

Age was an important fact that differentiated the classes (men, women and youths) in terms of their perceptions of the relations with the host communities. In Dzaleka the youth, most who grew up in Malawi rated the relations nine out of 10. This was often because most were born and educated in Malawi, speak the Chichewa language, went to the same schools, meet on a regular basis and have friendship relations. The much older men tended to rate the relations as poor to acrimonious, because of competition over access to resources. The older men and women in the host community tended to be more politically conscious and agitate for development, while often using the camp to lobby government for attention and prioritization in the allocation of resources.

9.0 Media use

9.1 Access to and use of various communication tools and media

Information on use of media can be both an indicator of welfare levels and provide relevant programming information as to which media channels are most suited to reaching the target population. This chapter looks at the use of various forms of media and also at subjective assessments of well-being amongst the four surveyed groups.

9.2 Cellphone ownership

Ownership of cell phones is higher in the Dzaleka area than in Luwani, especially in Dzaleka camp. Households in Dzaleka camp have 1,08 cell phones per household, compared to only 0,22 cell phones per household in Luwani camp. The two host communities are more equal, but both have significantly lower ownership than in Luwani camp.

Table 9.1: Average number of cell phones per household

| Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1,08 | 0,68 | 0,22 | 0,51 |

9.3 Radio as a means of communication

Radio remains the form of media most frequently used by households across all communities. This is especially true for the host communities and for Luwani camp. In Dzaleka camp, both TV and internet are accessed by approximately one in five households. Both Facebook and WhatsApp are used by the same proportion of households, thus showing some promise as a platform for communication with refugees in this camp. However, in Luwani camp and the host communities there seems to be little scope currently for reaching the target population through internet-based social media. In these areas only radio, and to a lesser degree TV, can currently function as a channel for reaching people with various messages.

Table 9.2: Proportions of households who use different forms of media at least once a week, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Radio | 29 | 41 | 25 | 30 |
| TV | 21 | 5 | 6 | 13 |
| Internet | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Facebook | 19 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Instagram | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| WhatsApp | 23 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

9.4 Content development

In Dzaleka communication is handled under multiple channels that is via community radio, word of mouth, social media and through the various notice boards in the camp. They also exchange through pasting messages on walls. The flow of information is faster in Dzaleka given that they are confined to a small space. The Connectivity project that has recently launched is another unique and innovative platform for sharing information. However, it is on the content that raised issues. There are appears to be less communication between refugees and UNHCR and other partners. There is no mechanism to trace content of the communication, except what comes via national media. The result is that negative rumors move faster than positive messages. UNHCR offices are overwhelmed, and have no publicity department, apart from one officer. This does not help in content development, which should regularly be coming from

all units. Having meetings is another method, yet when the meetings do not yield solutions, subsequent meetings become most difficult to mobilise attendance.

The complaints handling boxes are in the camp, but it is unclear if they are working to communicate issues in confidence to the UNHCR, because there is hardly any report back to the refugees. In Dzaleka, during the FGDs, a lot of complaints were raised, and when probed on whether they had communicated these they indicated to the positive.⁹ In Luwani, they indicated that the most efficient way they communicate with the Malawian communities is through the zone leaders, government staff, UNHCR office and other stakeholders present at the camp. The same organisations were said to be efficient at giving feedback if need be. The most important information needs for the asylum seekers was on the war issues back in Mozambique.

9.5 Conclusion

New internet-based forms of media communications such as Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp are not widespread amongst both camp and host populations. It thus seems that more traditional forms of media, in particular radio, still play a significant role in reaching target populations with various messages. In Dzaleka camp there may be some scope for using internet-based social media platforms for sharing information with the target population. The extension officers in the host communities remain important for communicating messages from government and other organisations. Yet, the offices are not equipped with communication equipment. In future programming, it may be necessary to see if there is scope for covering the villages close to the camps through the connectivity initiative and monitoring what channels are most important and the content of the messages that are in demand and relevant for the populations.

⁹ Note that no Key Informant Interviews were done to verify and authenticate the views shared in the FGDs. Therefore, the reader is urged to take caution in interpreting these results.

10.0 Subjective assessment of well-being

Throughout this report we have looked at various objective indicators of wellbeing. However, we also asked households to give an assessment of how they considered their own wellbeing. This can give a complementary picture to the one being portrayed by the objective indicators.

10.1 Non-food items as a measure of well being

When asking households about how they consider their condition in terms of housing, clothing and health care, there are few large differences between the groups. Between six and seven of 10 households across the four groups consider their housing conditions less than adequate. For clothing the proportions are between seven and eight of 10. When it comes to satisfaction with health care, there is a slightly higher dissatisfaction in the camps with approximately seven of 10 considering the condition less than adequate, compared to five of ten in Dzaleka host community and six of 10 in Luwani host community.

Table 10.1: Proportion of households who consider various conditions less than adequate for household needs, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Housing | 72 | 65 | 56 | 70 |
| Clothing | 76 | 68 | 81 | 82 |
| Health care | 71 | 50 | 69 | 58 |

10.2 Income as a measure of well being

Households were also asked to assess the adequacy of their current income. Very few responded that their income allowed them to build savings, although a significant proportion stated that they were able to save a little bit with their current income. Dzaleka host community reported the most saving, as one in two households said they could either build savings or save a little. Men in Dzaleka host community who were considered vulnerable were defined by those men who attended the focus group discussion as those that cannot afford to buy a MK23,000 bag of fertilizer (FDG, March 2017). The disabled were categorized as vulnerable on the basis of having special needs. Orphans and the elderly were also categorized as poor on the same basis. To categorize community members into vulnerable, poor and rich, the participants reported that they look at the agricultural outputs of the members. Those with higher outputs than their household needs are regarded as rich whereas those who cultivate less than their household needs are categorized as vulnerable.

Table 10.2: Subjective assessment of current income, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Average subjective assessment of own wealth ranking | 1,30 | 1,40 | 1,49 | 1,31 |
| Average subjective assessment of neighbors' wealth ranking | 1,24 | 1,32 | 1,20 | 1,19 |
| Average subjective assessment of friends' wealth ranking | 1,30 | 1,50 | 1,33 | 1,44 |

The same proportion in the Luwani host community was almost two in five. The smallest proportion of households being able to save some funds was in Luwani camp with one in five. In Luwani, the women described the poor as those who do not have any livestock, live in houses made of unburnt bricks and at times do not have houses of their own but seek shelter in other people's places. The better off are those that have some livestock such as goats or chickens, and live in houses with burnt bricks though grass thatched. The rich are described as those with good housing structures (burnt bricks and roofed with iron sheets), owning cattle,

goats, pigs, chickens, ducks, accessing farm land, and also owning big shops and may be able to hire other people to work for them.

Table 10.3: Subjective assessment of current income, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | Dzaleka Host | Luwani Camp | Luwani Host |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Income allows to build savings | 9 | 18 | 6 | 8 |
| Income allows a little savings | 17 | 32 | 12 | 26 |
| Income just meets expenses | 46 | 50 | 39 | 49 |
| Income not sufficient, hence need savings | 38 | 51 | 41 | 53 |

A six-step diagram that ranks the community by wealth status was used in the groups and produced the following results (table 10.4). Participants indicated their community was relatively poor and dependent on humanitarian assistance with few individuals who brought their own capital from their home country. The FGD of youth in Dzaleka showed that the youth perceived poverty as very widespread in the camp. They however, isolated the poor, and the better off and the rich due to the following characteristics: The rich have cars in the camp yet the poor cannot even afford a wheelbarrow; The rich have electricity yet the poor use candles for lighting; The rich can manage to get most household needs and send children to boarding schools in Malawi or outside the country; the rich have businesses and have many assets of a luxury nature such as access to digital television, plasma televisions, and business connection outside Dzaleka.

Table 10.4: Subjective wealth status as reported in the FGDs in Dzaleka and Luwani, percent

| | Dzaleka Camp | | | Dzaleka Host | | | Luwani Camp | | | Luwani Host | | |
|----------|--------------|-------|-----|--------------|-------|-----|-------------|-------|-----|-------------|-------|-----|
| | Youth | Women | Men | Youth | Women | Men | Youth | Women | Men | Youth | Women | Men |
| 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 2 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 3 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 20 |
| 4 | 10 | 2.5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 20 |
| 5 | 30 | 2.5 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 50 | 20 | 35 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 20 |
| 6 | 40 | 80 | 70 | 40 | 40 | 30 | 80 | 60 | 80 | 70 | 40 | 60 |

10.3 Conclusion

It can be safely concluded that subjective assessment of well-being does not function very well in the Malawian context and provides only rough indicators. Many in the host communities cannot read and write, and it is a complex exercise to extract derivatives of wealth status from them. In the refugee community, it can be done as many of them have some level of education. However, in distress situations people may be inclined to deliberately hide wealth rather than reveal it, where such wealth possession could jeopardize opportunities for aid or resettlement. Given this context, within groups they may also not reveal who they feel is wealthy, for fear that such information will easily get to the person and cause retribution.

11.0 Analysis of findings and recommendations

11.1 Analysis of findings

11.1.1 Complexity of refugee surveys and studies

This is the first survey of its kind focusing on refugees and asylum seekers and host communities in Malawi. The data produced by this survey gives a unique insight into the lives and livelihoods of the people living in and around Dzaleka and Luwani camps. Notwithstanding sample size limitations for the host communities and data challenges related to some indicators, the survey results can be used to understand who the refugees are and what they currently do. Of course, when combined with long-term studies on refugee and host community social systems, economic engagement and civic participation, the UNHCR Malawi may have a very good lens to understand how stable countries hosting refugees could provide answers that could apply elsewhere. This chapter summarizes the main findings from the survey.

11.1.2 Demographic patterns

Across the survey locations, there is an unusually high reporting of female-headed household. In addition, there seems to be a high presence of single-headed households, which may affect household's income-generating ability. About one in 10 households across all areas have a disabled member. The 18-59 year age group tends to dominate in terms of numbers. The implications are that there is a need to lobby for economic opportunities for both refugees and host communities. Yet, the caveat is that Malawi is an agrarian society, with limited formal sector jobs, a weak private sector and industrial based, with heavy dependence on fragile tobacco income and minerals. The service sector is the key space available and UNHCR and partners need to continue conversations with government on opportunities within plans and programmes to take advantage of the demographic dividend.

11.1.3 Shelter, assets and household services

Decent housing is a right for all, and the UNHCR has been providing materials to refugees upon arrival for construction of shelters. Iron sheets for roofing are more common in Luwani than in Dzaleka, indicating better housing conditions in Luwani. There is a need for speeding up the decongestion and re-planning of Dzaleka, as some zones are over populated. About two in 10 households in Luwani (camp and host) and about three in 10 in Dzaleka (camp and host) share their toilet facilities with other households. Across all communities there is a clear reliance on biomass from the surrounding area for cooking fuel, with many households, especially in Dzaleka camp, who do not have enough fuel to cook their food. There is very little access to electricity in any of the surveyed areas.

11.1.4 Status of humanitarian assistance

In UNHCR protection programming the provision of food for refugees and asylum seekers is at the core of its work. The agreement does not extend to host communities who either self-provide or in case of catastrophe such as floods and droughts, they receive assistance from donors via WFP, partners and GoM. In HSELA we found that Dzaleka host community seems to have received less outside support, whether humanitarian or otherwise, than the encamped communities. This is expected, given that encamped communities hardly produce and are dependent on food aid for a living, though some supplement through other income earning opportunities. These opportunities are limited due to the policy environment, as well as limited access to land to produce their own food.

11.1.5 Livelihoods opportunities and income sources

The livelihood patterns are different in the surveyed areas. In Luwani host community, most are self-employed, either in agriculture or non-agriculture. Households in Luwani camp have not yet established their livelihoods are still relying on assistance. In Dzaleka host community nine of 10 households are engaged in agriculture. In Dzaleka camp the livelihoods pattern is more varied, with both agriculture and non-agriculture in addition to support from outside. Only a small minority of households across all areas has more than one livelihood. Few self-employed households, both in agriculture and non-agriculture, employ others.

11.1.6 Agriculture as a source of income and food

Land and water are key factors of production. While results project a positive outcome of agricultural incomes in host communities, the survey did not go in-depth enough to understand the scope of the relationship of the camp and host communities. Previous studies and observations from the JAM showed that refugees and asylum seekers who rent out land, were successful in agriculture in the vicinity of the camp. The participants also reported that some refugees in the camp rent land in the host community on which they practice farming. They said that the refugees tend to use more and good quality farming inputs as they have a lot of support from various organizations in the camp. Through the use of such inputs, the refugee farmers produce higher quality produce than the host community. The refugee farmers, however, sell their produce at the same markets as the local farmers and at the same prices. Given the palpable quality differences between the produce of the two communities, customers tend to prefer produce from refugee farmers, displacing the host community farmers from agriculture in the process.

About half of the households in Dzaleka host community have access to irrigated water. In the other areas access to irrigation is a limiting factor for agriculture. Only about three of 10 households in Dzaleka camp and one in 10 in Luwani camp have cultivated any crop in the last season. Most farming households in Dzaleka use fertilizer for their maize. The use of fertilizer is less common in Luwani. The use of pesticide is much less common across all areas. The most important challenge in conducting agriculture is inadequate access to inputs. Livestock rearing is much more common in the host communities than in the camps, although one in five households in Dzaleka camp rear some livestock. Lack of cash is the most important challenge when conducting non-agricultural activities.

11.1.7 Non-agriculture sources of income

Non-agricultural activities are most common in Dzaleka camp, followed by both Luwani communities. These are usually in the traditional domains of trade, given the dense population in the camp. However, there are supplies that run short in the camp such as milk, eggs, chickens, etc. on a regular basis and thus this represents an opportunity within the camp itself. Dzaleka host community has few heads of households engaged in non-agricultural activities. Regarding traditional tailoring and accessories, there is a need for creative marketing, including online marketing, as well as product quality standardization to increase sales. For people looking to work, the biggest challenge is the limited amount of work opportunities.

11.1.8 Productive support systems for refugees and host communities

Membership in cooperatives, associations and social groups is much higher in the established host communities. There is little evidence of investments amongst all groups, but some savings are taking place. Community banking mechanisms seems to be of importance in the established host communities but less so in the camps.

11.1.9 Food expenditure and consumption patterns

This section will need to be read concurrently with the SENS (2017) report of UNHCR. The highest level of expenditure is in Dzaleka camp, with just over MK40,000 per month. The two host communities follow and Luwani camp has the lowest level of consumption with approximately MK25,000 per month. Luwani camp is also the location where the largest proportion is spent on food. In terms of food insecurity, Luwani camp seems to clearly be the main area of concern, underlined by the fact that only five percent of the households have adequate food consumption score, compared to approximately 30 percent in the other areas. The highest level of coping mechanisms employed was found, again, in Luwani camp with 73 percent and in Dzaleka camp with 74 percent. However, all areas showed high levels of coping mechanisms being applied. This may be a reflection of the humanitarian crisis that Malawi was still in the midst of at the time of data collection.

11.1.10 Security and relations of refugees with host communities

Security is a subject that is sensitive in refugee contexts. It can have diverse connotations and be misinterpreted if not well handled. In encamped communities, the propensity to exaggerate insecurity by outsiders may be used for other purposes. In some cases, there are also real issues of insecurity that affect refugees internally and externally. HSELA found that Dzaleka seems to have the highest level of security incidences. However, most reported cases are of a less serious nature. This was also confirmed during the FGDs.

11.1.11 Communication

The essence of communication in refugee situations is the need to be kept abreast of developments that impact them. Yet, communication is also about awareness raising, education, and access to services, products, institutions, and individuals. Therefore, the mechanism for reaching out to the people is key and platforms for such are required. Dzaleka camp has the highest level of cell phone ownership and the highest level of social media use. However, from the FGDs, it was established that refugees are seeking relevant information to meet their needs. They tend to therefore use multiple sources, with word of mouth being a fast mechanism for communication. The connectivity project being implemented at Dzaleka as a pilot will provide more experience on the effects of communication on the life of refugees. In the host communities, government structures and radio, tend to be dominant modes of communication.

11.2 Recommendations

In a refugee context, the sample size though on the lower scale, conforms to practices of small camps that do not require large sample sizes to reach firm conclusions. Given that UNHCR Malawi staff, partners, and researchers are regularly undertaking surveys, it is possible to make key recommendations based in HSELA with confidence. Of course, key is the follow up monitoring that for the livelihoods programme will be narrowed to the set of indicators agreed at the global, regional and country level. Several recommendations for future support to and programming for refugees in Malawi can be made:

11.2.1 Shelter and services

Most households in both camp and host settings use boreholes as sources of drinking water. However, the quality and security of these boreholes have not been assessed and should be looked into. While the use of open-air bush for toilet needs is rare, the most common toilet facility is a traditional latrine, with or without roof. It should be assessed whether the current toilet facilities are of proper hygienic standard. The main source of fuel for cooking is various forms of biomass. Malawi has generally a high pressure on its biomass, and it should be

explored whether more environmentally friendly sources of cooking fuel could be provided or facilitated.

11.2.2 Special needs and child labor

There are a significant proportion of households who have people with special needs, even with more serious conditions such as disability and chronic illness. It should be explored whether these households need special support. Across the four areas there are about 10 percent of households who report to have a child who is working during school hours. The children in these households need special attention and it should be explored whether they need special support and protection through UNHCR programmes.

11.2.3 Livelihoods

There are far fewer households engaged in agriculture in the camps than in the host communities, even in the well-established Dzaleka camp. Jointly with the Government of Malawi it should be explored whether there are barriers to participation in agriculture for refugees and what can be done to remove them. Given the propensity for trading and small-scale business establishment amongst the Dzaleka camp population, it could be explored whether livelihoods synergies with the agricultural host population could be facilitated through livelihoods programming. Access to water is an important limitation to agriculture in both areas, especially for camp populations. It should be explored whether this can be addressed through UNHCR livelihoods programming.

The main focus of agricultural production is maize. Livelihoods programmes could explore whether there are markets for other crops and what kind of support is needed for households to take up new crops. There seems also to be scope for more livestock rearing, especially in the camps. The most common livestock is chicken, whereas there are few larger animals. Again, it could be explored what kind of markets exist for commercial rearing of animals, and whether value chains could be established with producers in the area.

Small businesses providing simple services and selling and trading goods seem to be a key livelihood in Dzaleka camp. However, households are engaged in many different types of such businesses, making it difficult to tailor-make training for them. Nevertheless, it could be explored whether there are certain business skills such as accounting, marketing and the like that could be provided to this group. Most women aspire to raise some money and invest into small businesses, and this included aspirations to start a girls' empowerment programme/activities to reduce involvement in sex work. In addition to the above many women have the skills to do different businesses (e.g running a restaurant), but they lack enough capital. UNHCR needs to carefully study such businesses, to see which ones provide scope for employing others, rather than focusing on sectors that are already saturated.

In this context, the respondents saw opportunities in:

1. **Funding for start-ups and projects:** that are working but at very small-scale, and are regarded as being of insignificance to the households. Intervention with capital for a defined period in the form a credit was acceptable to many of the respondents. There are few households who are involved in community banking such as Village Savings and Loans. These programmes are quite common in Malawi, and UNHCR could partner with the Government of Malawi to explore how the refugee population could also be part of such community banking structures;

2. **Skills training by doing:** there are key areas of economic potential in the camps that remain unexplored. For instance, the manufacturing and value addition of agriculture products is limited, yet demand in the camp for processed food is high;
3. **Access to land:** Dzaleka is congested and the space to practice agriculture in a manner equivalent to host populations is very low. It is an area that requires government attention because the population has risen, yet the amount of land remains the same. Programmes that provide crop based inputs will face challenges without improved access to land;
4. **Alternatives to crops:** Investing in small animals in high volumes (chickens, egg production, pork and goat value chains) could be done. However, this needed to be done in a planned and orderly fashion given the congestion in the camp. Some Rwandese are renting land outside the camps that are used for grazing and a similar model could be backed with financial support;
5. **Building assets of the poor:** many of the refugees have neither assets nor appropriate technologies for processing goods for resale. This may need to be explored for large manufacturing of briquettes, bio-gas (using waste from the camps);
6. **Group based support model:** Host communities fared better in agriculture and have working ROSCAs and ISALs. It is recommended that livelihoods programming works with established groups first, as this lowers the administrative and monitoring costs.

There are few employment opportunities for the populations of all four areas. It could be explored whether the Government of Malawi, UNHCR and partners can facilitate establishment of business opportunities in the area. Men reported (FGD, March, 2017) wanting UNHCR to think of ways to substantively help them beyond giving them food rations. They said that the rations they receive are not adequate to enable an active life. Across all the FGDs in the camps they noted that people were idle despite having various skills because there are no job opportunities for them.

11.2.4 Vulnerability and food insecurity

The population in Luwani camp has the lowest level of consumption and asset ownership and has the highest need for assistance. The Dzaleka camp population is doing better, in particular the Rwandan population. These may be more self-reliant and thus need less assistance. The population in Luwani camp is very vulnerable to food insecurity and need to be assisted with food. Given that very few households in Luwani camp seem to have adequate food consumption, blanket distribution should be continued. There are also food insecure households in Dzaleka camp, but the proportions are lower, especially amongst people from Rwanda. Other data from the nutrition survey should be triangulated to come up with an appropriate targeting strategy.

11.2.5 Decision-making and social cohesion

There are also general problems of targeting noted in the FGDs. In Dzaleka men's group they alleged that the phones from the connectivity project were given to women, which created tensions in the households. They recommended that, where resources are minimal there should be a balance in the provisioning. At times, they agreed that there are certain groups that require prioritization, which requires community consultation and communication. They noted that they know the community better and they can assist with such targeting.

The youth had generally low confidence in current decision-making systems. Rating their confidence level in the current decision-making systems between 0 and 10, the youth agreed

on a rating of four. They had concerns on how targeting and distribution of services and other benefits from external organisations is carried out, resulting in this low rating of trust in such systems. Distrust was associated with the leaders because the leaders tend to target their relatives in such cases.

11.2.6 Safety and security

Dzaleka camp has the highest level of security incidences. However, the types of incidences are not of the most serious kind. The root causes of these incidences are not known. Jointly with the Government of Malawi, it should be explored whether increasing security or policing would be an appropriate response to address these concerns.

11.2.7 Media Use

New internet-based forms of media communications such as Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp are not widespread amongst both camp and host populations. It thus seems that more traditional forms of media, in particular radio, will still play a significant role in reaching target populations with various messages. In Dzaleka camp there may be some scope for using internet-based social media platforms for sharing information with the target population.

12.0 Conclusion

The Malawi refugees programme managed by the Government of Malawi with the support of UNHCR faces multiple challenges and is a protracted situation for the main camp Dzaleka in Dowa district. The camp was founded in 1994, and is heavily congested with approximately two thirds of the total population of refugees and asylum seekers living on just 201 hectares of land. As a result, there has been spillover of households into the Malawi society, irrespective of the soft encampment policy retained by the Government of Malawi. Luwani camp is relatively decongested and has improved infrastructure in the form of housing, school infrastructure. However, both camps were not designed with livelihoods in mind and were seen as temporary.

The lack of livelihoods opportunities and the varied skills that refugees and asylum seekers have is not optimally utilized in the Malawi economy because they are regarded as visitors. Certainly, there is significant movement in and out of the camp, but the overall numbers in Malawi have remained on the same borderline of 30,000. The numbers would have been less had it not been for the Mozambican caseload that led to the re-opening of Luwani camp.

In the past, the operation has undertaken several surveys and increased programming support. The Government of Malawi has been generous in meeting its international obligations and support to UNHCR. However, there have been flashes of agitation from the host population. This has been proactively managed to foster greater co-existence. Nevertheless, such an approach alone is not enough, which implies the need to increase livelihoods opportunities equally in the camps and host populations. The challenges they face at household level are almost the same. They live side by side, intermarry and share resources.

The HSELA17 has provided a lens to better understand the challenges and offers solutions that may help to address these. Clearly, the need for stronger livelihoods support is relevant. In both camps physical visits show a desperate situation for some of the refugees, in a country that struggles with poverty and under development. Yet, it is one of the friendliest countries to asylum seekers and is willing to share the burden. Through this evidence, it is hoped that it will shed more light on the precarious situation of refugees, as well as on that of hosting populations. The forthcoming Malawi UNDAF has had significant input by UNHCR, and hopefully through evidence gathered such as in HSELA17, there will be more debate and action towards incorporating refugee and asylum seekers into national policies and planning programmes from the local to the national level.

A multi-year livelihoods strategy is now in place, and the UNHCR Malawi is also developing a Multi-Year Multi-Partner Protection and Solutions Strategy (MYMPPSS). While, there is a need for wider community based infrastructure to promote economic activities, there is an equal need to build the assets of the poor through a multi-pronged strategy that considers the context of Malawi. The economy is highly informalized, with a poor majority, a weak industrial base, weak social services, lack of industrialization and highly import dependent. The informal sector is a key absorber of the population for livelihoods, while agriculture is key to the sustenance of the population.

In this context, the results show that it is clear there is a need for developing the asset base of the poor households. This will depressurize the need for large-scale external financial support, if refugees and asylum seekers are given an opportunity to practice a variety of economic activities that will not displace the Malawian population. Through a gradual approach, results

can start to show in the next 5 years if an incremental market-based approach is adopted by UNHCR in its programming. Selecting those value chains with significant economic multiplier effects in terms of product supply and employment creation, is a key strategy. Land may be limited, which means the UNHCR will need to be strategic in terms of its agriculture interventions, as there are key areas of agriculture processing and marketing that remain unexplored.

Key conclusions reached from the data show significant challenges for refugees, asylum seekers and host populations. The report is elaborate with its central focus being on understanding the households' livelihoods conditions. For refugees and asylum seekers these are part of their long-drawn struggles against adversity. In this context the design was deliberate in aiming to better understand the context in which refugees and asylum seekers in particular undertake economic activities and derive resources from a wide range of sources for a living. Key to the use of the data is how to benchmark plans and programmes collectively, where livelihoods are central. This does not mean that other programmes are less important. In fact, a holistic understanding of protection, humanitarian and food security, helps better place the multi-year livelihoods strategy based on the agreed global benchmarks. The Malawi household profiles were thus crucial to baseline comprehensively.