



PAKISTAN



Jerma registration site/ May 2013/ Photos Protection cluster

## **Protection cluster Briefing Note # 3<sup>1</sup> on the Tirah Valley displacement Consultations during the registration process in the Jerma assistance hub, Kohat district (29-30 April 2013)**

### **1. Introduction and background**

The Protection Cluster, through its various members, remains engaged in protection monitoring of Tirah valley IDPs situation in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province and FATA region in order to assess situations, needs and intentions of the newly displaced population. To this aim, common tools – specific for different situations - have been prepared to support partners to better carry out monitoring activities largely through semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and to report the various findings.

Immediately after the opening by UNHCR of the Jerma registration and assistance hub and the start of the activities to register and assist IDP families from Tirah Valley on 27<sup>th</sup> April, UNHCR and its partner Sarhad Rural Support Programme (SRSP) as well as Protection cluster (IRC) conducted a series of consultation with the IDP population focusing on the general situation of the IDP families but also on some elements connected to the process of registration in the Government-designated location of Jerma. In addition, UNHCR conducted an internal assessment on registration process in Jerma, bringing some technical recommendations for the process<sup>2</sup>.

In total, 32 FGDs were conducted between 29 to 30 April with 176 individuals<sup>3</sup>. Individuals were approached while waiting at the Jerma registration point. Only men were consulted due to cultural sensitivities, and as – de facto – they represented the majority of the IDPs that appeared at the registration site.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The first two notes were issued on 5<sup>th</sup> April (General Preliminary observations and recommendations) and 20 April (FGDs with newly arrived IDPs in Kohat), respectively.

<sup>2</sup> See “Listing/Registration Exercise for Bagh Maydan Tirah Valley IDPs of Khyber Agency 27th April to 7th May 2013”, issued by UNHCR on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013.

<sup>3</sup> The Protection Cluster members were given a choice to select either Key Informants of FGD, with the clear priority not to disrupt the registration process.

Out of the 176 males who participated in the 32 FGDs, the greatest majority (94%) was represented by adult men between 19 and 59 years of age, while 8 individuals (4.5%) were boys under 18 years old, and one participant was an older person of above 60 years old. 2 of the volunteering participants were persons with disabilities.

## **2. Population, displacement trends**

According to the information received from the FGD participants, the majority of the IDP Heads of Households arriving for the registration in Kohat were displaced in the Peshawar valley. In all but three FGD, persons stated that they have travelled from the Peshawar Valley, with only a few cases stating that their current area of displacement was Kohat or – in one FGD – Hangu. This was later confirmed by the analysis of the registration trends by UNHCR during the first week of registration, showing that out of the 17,839 families registered up to 6th May 2013, more than 9,750 declared to be displaced in the Peshawar Valley and of those, more than 6,000 were registered in Kohat<sup>5</sup>.

All participants to the FGD indicated that they had arrived from Tirah valley in the second half of March 2013, at the height of the conflict. Reportedly, most IDP families are currently living with family members or are renting houses. The answers provided in the FGD varied from a totality of participants reporting that they rented their accommodation, to a 50-50 split, to situations in which the extended family arrangements prevailed.

Asked whether this was the first occasion to be tracked or registered, the majority of the IDP consulted stated that they were not tracked anywhere during the flight or upon arrival to places of displacement. Only in three discussions the IDP affirmed to have received tokens distributed by Scouts in Orakzai agency and by the Political Agent through Security Forces in Sadda, Peer Mila Tangi in Khurram agency and Dabori in Orakzai agency<sup>6</sup>.

## **3. Settlement Intentions**

From all FGDs, it emerged that the displaced came to Kohat district, Jerma only to register and did not intend to settle in Kohat district. In almost none of the FGDs this intention was expressed.

Seemingly, as in previous consultations, participants reported to prefer a settlement in hosting families rather than in camp due to an enhanced perception of security compared to the more visible environment of the camps. This opinion was practically unanimous amongst IDP consulted.

Considering the overall situation and the advocacy position earlier expressed on the Tirah displacement, the Protection Cluster was attentive in detecting possible instances of forced relocations of IDPs from the current place of displacement to other areas, Kohat in particular. However, according to the consulted IDPs, no family had so far been put under pressure to move to another location from the current place of displacement.

## **4. Access to information on the registration**

The consultations revealed that the IDP families did not possess full information on the process of registration and – when they were somehow informed – the channels varied. In many instances, IDPs got to know about

---

<sup>4</sup> Following earlier recommendations, the protection cluster members have conducted 31 separate FGDs with Tirah valley displaced girls and women. The findings will be shared by protection cluster shortly.

<sup>5</sup> See UNHCR data in the HCR presentation for the Donor Briefing on 8<sup>th</sup> may 2013.

<sup>6</sup> It was however not clear what kind of assistance and benefits the IDPs had received through those tokens.

the registration from relatives. In about 12 FGD the majority of IDPs declared to have been informed by community leaders, i.e. the traditional channel used, especially when the listing process preceding the registration is organized by tribes. In 5 FGDs, IDPs explicitly mentioned the role of the authorities. Media (newspapers or others) appeared in very few responses, as well as NGOs. It was therefore evident that no single channel was dominant to pass the information on registration and systematically to inform IDPs on the registration location and procedure.

Only in 5 FGDs, participants reported to be aware of the registration criteria and in an even less number of FGDs IDPs seemed to have an idea on how long the process would take to be registered. However, information banners on the process and the requirement for registration were fully displayed at the registration hub and IDPs could read them – or having it explained by literate members of the community – when reaching the centre and during waiting time.

تاریخ (Date)	قبیلہ (Tribe)	تاریخ رجسٹریشن (Registration Date)
27.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	27.04.2013
28.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	28.04.2013
29.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	29.04.2013
30.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	30.04.2013
01.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	01.05.2013
02.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	02.05.2013
03.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	03.05.2013
04.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	04.05.2013

تاریخ (Date)	قبیلہ (Tribe)	تاریخ رجسٹریشن (Registration Date)
28.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	28.04.2013
29.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	29.04.2013
30.04.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	30.04.2013
01.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	01.05.2013
02.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	02.05.2013
03.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	03.05.2013
04.05.2013	گوجرانوئل (Gujranwala)	04.05.2013

Details (Tribes) and Dates of Registration/ Photo Protection cluster (IRC)

### 5. Travel arrangements by IDPs for the registration

From the FGDs it appeared that all participants had come to the registration site in Kohat alone, as head of households and without other family members<sup>7</sup>. As the registration was a staged process of listing, registration and form delivery, IDPs reported to spend this time – normally including overnight stay - in various arrangements: some with relatives/ extended families (reported in some 5 FGDs), others in hotels (reported in 15 FGDs), many also in the local mosques (reported in 14 FGDs). Free accommodation was clearly preferred.

On the means of transport to Jerma registration point, in 27 FGDs IDPs almost unanimously reported having come by public transport and only in 5 FGDs by private vehicle, normally pooled with other IDPs going to Jerma for the registration process. The travel time to Jerma depended on the area of displacement of the IDPs, but considering the widespread number of head of households coming from the Peshawar Valley, most of the FGDs participants indicated a travel time between 3 to 5 hours.

The travel to Kohat/Jerma did not pose significant security problem, according to the IDPs. The question was posed due to the concerns for the specific profile of this IDP population. In very few cases (2 FGDs), IDPs complained about the length of the journey and the logistic difficulties. In other cases, checks from the Police were reported, but defined “normal” and not associated with cases of harassment or misbehaviour<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> To note that – as in the past registration – the presence of the other family members was not requested and family composition on the registration form was tracked on the basis of the declaration of the HoH, as it a “level 2” type of registration. The registration form, however, tried to capture specific vulnerabilities of the family members.

<sup>8</sup> The Protection Cluster has brought to the attention of the authorities some earlier reported cases of alleged harassment and extortion by the Police at the expenses of IDPs travelling from the conflict areas. Protection Cluster members engaged

As registered IDPs were receiving one time food distribution in Jerma, the majority arranged private transport to bring the items back to their areas of displacement, while in very few cases public transport was used for this purpose. According to the IDP consulted, these arrangements could cost up to 1,200 PKR.<sup>9</sup>

## **6. Civil documentation**

With regards to the possession of civil documentation, all consulted head of households reported to be in possession of a CNIC. This was confirmed by the registration staff of UNHCR and partners and was also emerging from the inter-cluster survey conducted few days in advance<sup>10</sup>. In all cases, the IDPs seemed to be aware of the process of acquisition of a CNIC (22 FGDs provided quite univocal answers). To note that the common opinion of the IDPs on the cost of the CNIC was between 1,500 and 2,000 PKR, which seems to be much higher than the fees requested by NADRA for a normal procedure<sup>11</sup>.

It is to note that – presumably due to the election-related duties – the NADRA mobile van was not present in Jerma registration point at the time of the exercise.

As far as the main challenges related to documentation, the consulted IDPs reported the dual address on the CNIC and the fact that they may have come from non-notified areas. Those cases, however, were not the majority. In 2 FGDs few cases of IDPs rejected due to their areas of origin falling outside the notified areas were reported<sup>12</sup>.

The knowledge of the existing grievances desk in the registration hub in Jerma was well known and in 29 FGDs IDPs resulted to be aware of the available complaint mechanism.

## **7. IDP observations on the registration process and the registration centre lay-out**

Participants recognised the efforts made by the organisers to consider the specific needs of women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities in the lay-out of the registration centre. Although the presence of women HoH coming for the registration was admittedly limited, all IDPs recognised that adequate space and specific arrangements were put in place for women. IDPs in all FGDs recognised that the registration hub was proportionally equipped to host women and children, respecting local cultural norms (purdah). More nuanced were the replies as of whether the space for children was adequate.

As for access to water and wash facilities, all IDPs consulted unanimously recognised that they had access to safe drinking water as well as to WASH facilities. The presence of separate WASH facilities for women was also

---

in monitoring will continue to report such cases but will need to enhance efforts in becoming more specific on the context in which the alleged incident occurred, in order to allow the authorities to bring the case to the attention of the Police or other Law enforcement Actors with more ground and evidence, while maintaining due consideration for the confidentiality of the source.

<sup>9</sup> To note that NFIs and hygiene kits were not distributed in Jerma.

<sup>10</sup> According to the results of the Inter-cluster survey (Protection section), 87.7% of the respondents reported that the HOH possesses a CNIC (95% MR, 69% FR).

<sup>11</sup> See NADRA Web-site <http://www.nadra.gov.pk/index.php/products/cards/cnic> and [http://www.nadra.gov.pk/docs/cnic\\_checklist.pdf](http://www.nadra.gov.pk/docs/cnic_checklist.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> It is to note, however, the criterion of the notification was flexibly applied. It appeared evident in fact that the 98 villages notified by the Government were not an exhaustive lists and nearby Tirah villages to the notified ones – equally affected by the conflict – were not included. In those cases, an inclusion criterion was applied.

remarked and positively assessed. In 28 FGD, IDPs referred that a health facility was available in Jerma. This was in fact confirmed by the presence of the Department of Health Desk<sup>13</sup>.



Facilities at Registration Point in Kohat / Photo IRC and UNHCR

With respect to the security arrangements put in place, all consulted IDPs stated that they felt secure in the Jerma registration area, and indicated that the Police presence was adequate. Only in three FGDs some opinion were voiced that the security would be better ensured by the presence of the Army.

None of the participants to the FGDs reported to have experienced security concern while being in Kohat district. In none of the FGDs the consulted IDPs mentioned to have received pressure or individual threats trying to dissuade them from registering or – conversely – exercising pressure to register.

Asked about which suggestion IDPs wanted to make on the different aspect of the registration process, from logistical to procedural, in more than 50% of the consultations there was no concrete suggestion. When a suggestion was made, IDPs largely highlighted the importance to speed up the process of registration and the time spent at the registration hub, including for older persons and possibly persons with disabilities. A significant opinion emerging from the discussion was also the desire of IDPs to be treated with respect and consideration (issue emerging in 13 FGDs). A specific suggestion to open a dedicated desk for older persons and persons with disabilities was mentioned in three FGDs. Finally, in some FGD, IDPs mentioned the opportunity to open some registration activities in the Peshawar Valley.

## 8. Recommendations

- Discuss alternatives to extend the coverage of registration to facilitate access, including for persons with specific needs that may not be able to reach the Jerma registration point; while considering objectively the security constraints, explore the possibility of mobile registration [PDMA and UNHCR];
- Try to improve the information campaign on registration locations and criteria to properly include all IDPs from conflict-affected areas [UNHCR, PDMA, FDMA];
- Discuss amongst protection counterparts how to best provide monitoring and referral support in the registration points, including if mobile activities are undertaken [Protection Cluster];
- While continuing the registration in Kohat, renew efforts to ensure the presence of Government institutions and Departments that can provide support to the IDPs and their families, particularly on civil documentation

<sup>13</sup> To note that – according to UNHCR information - in the following days also the Department for Social Welfare established a desk in the registration hub.

issues (NADRA), health issues (Department of Health), social safety and child protection issues (Department of Social Welfare) [PDMA and UNHCR];

- Continue to ensure that assistance can be provided by partners to Tirah valley IDPs wherever the needs are and focusing on the most vulnerable segments of the population [OCHA, UNHCR, PDMA, IVAP, Protection Cluster];
- Advocate for additional funding to assist Tirah valley IDPs and conduct protection activities, in line with the strategy already outlined in the HOP 2013 [Protection Cluster]

Protection Cluster Peshawar/ Islamabad 13 May 2013

## Annex I – Overview of the FGDs participants

FGDs	Date	Group Participant M/F	# Persons consulted in the group	Age profile of the group n. persons < 18	Age profile of the group n. persons 19-59	Age profile of the group n. persons > 60	Number of persons with disabilities in the group
1	29-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
2	29-04-2013	Male	12	0	12	0	0
3	29-04-2013	Male	5	1	4	0	0
4	29-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
5	29-04-2013	Male	4	0	4	0	0
6	29-04-2013	Male	4	1	3	0	0
7	29-04-2013	Male	4	2	2	0	0
8	29-04-2013	Male	7	3	4	0	0
9	29-04-2013	Male	6	0	5	1	0
10	29-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
11	29-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
12	29-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
13	29-04-2013	Male	5	1	4	0	0
14	29-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
15	29-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
16	29/04/2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
17	29/04/2013	Male	7	0	7	0	0
18	30-04-2013	Male	4	0	4	0	0
19	30-04-2013	Male	7	0	7	0	1
20	30-04-2013	Male	8	0	8	0	1
21	30-04-2013	Male	4	0	4	0	0
22	30-04-2013	Male	7	0	7	0	0
23	30-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
24	30-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
25	30-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
26	30-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
27	30-04-2013	Male	6	0	6	0	0
28	30-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
29	30-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
30	30-04-2013	Male	5	0	5	0	0
31	30-04-2013	Male	3	0	3	0	0
32	30-04-2013	Male	4	0	4	0	0
<b>Total persons consulted by age</b>			<b>177</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>In % of the total interviewed</b>				4.5%	94.9%	0.6%	1.1%

**Annex II- Map of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa**

