

Summary Report

Darfur Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment

Prepared by: C. Kelly, CARE International/Benfield Hazard Research Centre¹

"Peace on earth depends on our ability to secure our living environment."
Ole Danbolt Mjoes, Norwegian Nobel Committee².

Summary

The environment is a critical element of the causes and impact of the crisis in Darfur. A rapid environmental impact assessment of the Darfur crisis by CARE International and Benfield Hazard Research Centre, supported by USAID/OFDA and UNEP/OCHA, was conducted from 10 September to 3 October 2004. The assessment indicated that consideration of environment issues has not been a prominent feature in the external response to the crisis at the policy or operational level. An exception is the issue of the provision of cooking fuel, although this is primarily a protection (i.e., safety of women and children) rather than an environmental issue. The lack of consideration of the environmental roots and impacts of the Darfur crisis and emergency operations has not likely resulted in any irreversible environmental damage. But negative consequences can be expected if the environment is not given a greater prominence in policy and operations. The assessment identifies specific policy and operational issues and actions which need to be addressed on a priority basis. Guidance on addressing these issues is, in many cases, easily transferred from established procedures and practice for dealing with refugees. Specific issues requiring immediate attention are (1) fire safety in camps, (2) security in areas outside camps used for wood and grass collection, (3) the sustainable provision of water, and (4) sustainable management of solid and liquid waste to reduce the opportunities for disease transmission. A small number of additional field staff are needed to integrate the environment into ongoing operations and plans.

This assessment was conducted with the financial support of the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, U. S. Agency for International Development, under Award No. DFD-A-00-04-00122-00 and by the Joint UNEP/OCHA Environment Unit (Geneva). The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not represent the views of the U. S. Agency for International Development, the United Nations, CARE International or Benfield Hazard Research Centre, Univ. College London.

¹ Contact: 72734.2412@compuserve.com

² **Kenyan in surprise Nobel peace win**, www.CNN.com, October 8, 2004 Posted: 11:42 AM EDT (1542 GMT)

Introduction

The Role of the Environment

The conflict in Darfur is said to be one of the worse humanitarian crisis in the world. Long standing conflict over environmental resources is one of the root causes of the current crisis. The displacement of millions of individuals and their concentration in camps and around towns is having impacts on the environment. Identifying and understanding these impacts is critical for effective relief operations which contribute to relieving suffering and a return to peaceful conditions.

While the environment is an important factor in the Darfur crisis, there is no international agency with a specific mandate to consider or incorporate environmental issues into relief operations and peace efforts. This contrasts with the case for Darfur refugees in Chad, where UNHCR has a mandate to incorporate environmental issues into relief and return efforts.

The Assessment

Recognizing the importance of the environment in the Darfur crisis, CARE International and the Benfield Hazard Research Center (University College London) conducted a rapid environmental impact assessment for Darfur from 10 September to 3 October, 2004. This report provides a summary of the critical findings and recommendations resulting from the assessment. The assessment was followed by briefings in Geneva (OCHA) and Washington (USAID/OFDA).

The assessment was conducted by Charles Kelly, seconded to CARE International by Benfield Hazard Research Centre. Local support for the assessment was provided by CARE Sudan (Khartoum and Nyala) and Norwegian Church Aid/ACT (in Nyala). The assessment was funded by USAID/OFDA under the Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment cooperative agreement with CARE, and by UNEP/OCHA.

The assessment used the Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment (REA) process as the framework for assessment activities³. The assessment also focused on programmatic issues, that is how organization involved in funding or guiding the crisis response had or were going to include environmental considerations into the current and future response to the Darfur crisis.

The assessment was conducted in Khartoum and Nyala (meetings with key organization, participation in coordination meetings, a REA organizational level assessment in both locations) and in three IDP camps: Kalma, Otash and Bajoum (near Taishia/Teishia), where a total of four community-level assessments were conducted. Time did not allow for visits to other parts of Darfur, but the results of the assessment are considered to be broadly applicable to the whole crisis-affected region. A short training in the REA process was also conducted in Khartoum at the end of the assessment.

Organization of the Report

The main part of the report contains critical assessment findings and recommended actions on environmental aspects of the crisis in Darfur. Annexes to the report contain tabulated data from the REA organizational and community level assessments. ***The annexed reports include considerable information, not presented in the main report, which should be considered in medium relief and recovery plans for Darfur.***

³ See http://www.benfieldhrc.org/SiteRoot/disaster_studies/rea/rea_index.htm

The key findings and recommendations of the assessment are presented in summary form so that they can be quickly reviewed and used in operations in Darfur. Findings and recommendations are divided into two parts:

1. Those dealing with general policy and program issues, arising from the review of institutional aspects of the response to the crisis, and,
2. Those dealing with specific environment-related challenges of emergency activities, identified through the organization and community level reviews of relief operations.

While there are direct links between the two sets of findings and recommendations, they are presented separately because:

- They were identified using different approaches and,
- The individuals responsible for addressing the issues identified fall into different categories: Policy makers for the institutional issues and Field personnel for the operational issues.

General Findings

The following bullets summarize information collected on relationships between the the IDPs, the environment, relief operations and the conflict in Darfur.

- IDPs are generally asset poor, having lost some or all possessions due to fighting and displacement.
- IDPs depend on local natural resources, particularly trees and grass, to meet current needs.
- The environmental impact of this dependency is probably locally significant but not irreversible if managed properly.
- The need for (1) food, (2) fuel, and (3) household items appear to be the key drivers in IDP exploitation of natural resources.
- Collecting wood and grass is dangerous and is a critical protection issue, with the burden falling more specifically on females.
- The environment has a relatively low and generally non-specific profile in response operations and plans.
- Immediate, medium and long term environmental impacts of relief operations have not been systematically considered. Significant negative impacts may occur if mitigation actions are not taken.
- Available methods, approaches, technologies and capacities to avoid, mitigate or manage environmental impacts are not generally being used in the Darfur crisis.
- IO/NGO field staff are generally aware of many immediate environmental issues but lack the time and job descriptions to systematically address these issues.
- Camp operations (with exceptions) are below standard, and fraught with safety and environmental issues.
- The Joint Logistics Centre work on fuel efficient stoves (of merit in itself) hides the complexity of addressing the fuel issue and risks contributing to a worsening of environmental impact and no reduction in danger to IDPs. The overall approach to fuel is fragmenting and risks the same negative lessons already learned.

General Recommendations

- Incorporate environmental conditions and natural resource issues into negotiations on temporary and permanent peace in Darfur.
- Include environmental issues as core cross-cutting themes in relief and recovery activities.

- Incorporate environmental impact assessment into relief plans and operations. While the crisis continues, the evolution of emergency response provides a strong need and sufficient opportunities for forward-looking impact assessments.
- Monitor the environmental impact of IDPs.
- Significantly increase food and Non-Food Item (NFI) assistance to reduce pressure on natural resources near IDP camps.
- Provide cash in lieu of food and NFIs in urban and peri-urban camps (taking into account potential negative impacts on supplies and costs.)
- Restructure the response to the fuel issue to consider it as a critical protection issue involving natural resources.
- Implement a more nuanced approach to the provision of cooking fuel, recognizing that environmental impact is not the most important consideration in all locations and that sustainability of activities is critical to reduced environmental impact and improved safety.
- Integrate lessons and procedures from refugee situations into the Darfur response.
- Conduct environmental impact reviews of IDP camps, focusing on immediate life-critical environmental improvements, and address the issues identified.
- Provide problem-specific technical assistance on identifying and addressing current and expected environmental impacts.
- Provide additional field staff to assist IO/NGOs in the operational integration of the environment as a cross-cutting theme in relief and recovery activities. At least one environmental advisor is immediately needed in each state in the Darfur region.

Operational Findings and Recommendations

The following table summarizes critical issues (findings) identified through the operational and community level assessments (see annexes). Specific initial actions (recommendations) are identified to address these issues.

The recommended actions are presented as the starting point for more detailed planning and response activities. The actions are based on the REA approach of focusing on:

- Quick fixes to ongoing projects,
- New projects when needed to address uncovered needs,
- Technical assistance for issues not easily addressed locally, and,
- Advocacy for the crisis victims to resolve issues which cannot be addressed through the other three approaches.

Camp-level environmental impact assessments are recommended as a quick and easy way to link many of the issues identified in the assessment with specific problems and solutions within a specific camp. A format for camp-level assessments is available from UNHCR/Khartoum. This format can be expanded to include specific operational issues identified below.

Issue	Action
Warfare	Advocate for a stop to the fighting.
Risk of fire due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction methods. • Concentration of people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce fire proneness and shift construction to less flammable materials. • Establish firebreaks and fire prevention plans in camps.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ban cooking in shelters.
Inadequate personal safety, arising from danger poses by the collection of wood, grass and other natural resources for cooking and for income to meet basic needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for an immediate stop to fighting near camps. • Create safe zones around IDP areas to allow for the safe and sustainable collection of natural resources. • Implement activities allow camp residents to collect fuel in a safe and sustainable manner, or provide fuel in a sustainable manner if direct collection cannot safely take place. • Reduce the need to collect wood, grass or other hazardous activities by providing alternative livelihood options.
Lighting	Provide lighting within camps to improve security ⁴ .
Water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate supply • Unaddressed opportunities for disease transmission • Unsafe use of chemicals (some camps) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase sustainable potable water supplies. • Improve management of water sites. • Immediately reduce opportunities for disease transmission due to standing water. • Implement standard safe handling and storage procedures for chemicals in all locations.
Disease – Human	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase health care delivery. • Increase disease surveillance and preventive and curative activities.
Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase availability and access to food. • Provide milled foods (reduced cooking time and milling cost to beneficiary) • Consider providing cash or script in lieu of food in urban or peri-urban camps to encourage the use of the local market to meet basic needs.

⁴ The manner and mechanisms of providing lighting should be based on consultations with camp residents. Public and facility lighting can also support educational and commercial activities during dark hours. Mechanisms for providing lighting range from generators to solar panels and batteries.

<p>Sanitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate control of insects and breeding sites • Inappropriate waste management. • Possible improper disposal of medical waste. • Additional environmental pollution (some camps) • Increase in disease/vector transmission (some camps) • Creation of hazardous waste sites (some camps) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand waste management activities for greater impact and coverage. • Eliminate vector breeding sites through pro-active liquid and solid waste management. • Reduce waste production and increase recycling. • Establish system for safe waste disposal. • Integrate waste reduction into assistance activities and increase recycling and composting. • Recycle and safely compost waste where possible. • Expand health education to reduce the creation of hazardous waste sites.
<p>Capacity to absorb waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide systems for the safe disposal of human waste in latrines. • Increase waste collection and safe disposal • Include recycling and composting in ongoing and new sanitation activities.
<p>Limited livelihood base</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversify livelihood base. • Provide cash or script as payment for work in urban and peri-urban camps.
<p>Relief Supplies – All environmental issues identified in the assessment form.</p>	<p>Provide assistance that meets food and other needs of the population.</p>

**Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment – Darfur
Organizational Assessment – Nyala**

Prepared by: C. Kelly, Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment Project⁵

Summary

An organization level rapid environmental impact assessment in South Darfur was conducted using the REA Guidelines methodology. The assessment involved seven individuals from IOs, NGOs and donors working on the IDPs crisis in South Darfur. A total of 32 salient issues affecting life, welfare or the environment were identified. Of these, fifteen were identified as presenting an immediate threat to life and requiring immediate attention. These critical issues fall into two broad categories, related to the:

- Safety of IDPs, including the risk of fire to camp infrastructure and harm from attacks while collecting wood and other natural resources.
- Provision of basic services, particularly health care, sanitation and water.

Other issues identified relate to negative impacts on the welfare of IDPs or the environment in which they live. Interventions to address these issues are less critical, but should be prioritized as part of on-going activities. Options to address each of the issues identified are included in the report. In the assessment, all basic needs identified were either “not met at all” or the “lesser part of needs met than not met”. This outcome highlights the significant gap which remains to be met through the provision of relief assistance. In addition, the assessment indicated that current efforts to meet basic needs were not sustainable because of the uncertainty in support from donors. The assessment does not represent the views of any of individuals or organizations which participated in the assessment process.

Introduction

An organizational level rapid environmental assessment (REA) was conducted at the OCHA Nyala office on 26 September 2004. The assessment followed the Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment⁶ process and involved representatives from seven organizations based on Nyala (South Darfur) and responding to the Darfur crisis. The assessment meeting was completed in 1 hours and 40 minutes⁷. The assessment was facilitated by C. Kelly, who prepared this report and to whom questions should be directed.

This document provides:

- A summary of priority issues identified in the assessment and proposed corresponding actions,
- Results of a participant review of the assessment session and,
- The raw data forms used in the assessment (Annex A). The forms have been condensed. The full format can be found in the Guidelines.

Annex B contains background information provided to the participants at the start of the assessment.

The Darfur crisis is dynamic, with only partial knowledge of conditions for conflict-affected populations available. The assessment is based on subjective perceptions of current conditions using the best available information. Assessment results are likely to change as new information becomes available.

The results presented in this report have been shared with participants. However, **the report does not represent the individual views of participants or their sponsoring organizations.**

The Nyala organizational level assessment results will be consolidated with assessment results from Khartoum and from community assessments to generate a single list of issues and recommended actions. The consolidated assessment is provided in a separate report.

One challenge faced in the South Darfur assessment is that the provision of assistance, and conditions in IDP camps, varies across the state. The assessment focused on the more negative conditions identified

⁵ Contact: 72734.2412@compuserve.com

⁶ http://www.benfieldhrc.org/SiteRoot/disaster_studies/rea/rea_index.htm

⁷ A full organization level assessment is expected require at least four hours.

in discussions to identify issues needing critical interventions. Some assistance programs may have already address issues identified in the assessment. Some camps may exist under better conditions than represented in the report.

Summary of Results

The following tables provide the priority issues identified during the Nyala assessment session. The tables were generated based on the process set out in the Guidelines. The first table summarizes issues with an immediate impact on life which require immediate action.

In the assessment, a number of basic needs (e.g., water, food), were identified as not being fully met in South Darfur. However, only those issues which were identified as “not met at all” have been designated as priority issues for the purposes of this assessment. All the other issues (water supply, food, shelter, personal safety, health care, waste management, domestic resources, clothing and transport) were rated as the “lesser part of needs met than not met”.

However, it was concluded that the means by which all basic needs are being met is not sustainable due to a dependency on uncertain donor funding to provide assistance. If this is the case, then all the basic needs become issues which require immediate action.

The second table provides items which affect welfare or the environment, considered to be of lower priority in terms of immediate action. These items can either wait until higher priority issues have been addressed, or be addressed through longer term (weeks) modifications to assistance activities. In many cases, these issues can be addressed as part of the on-going expansion of assistance activities in South Darfur

The identification of actions was done by the facilitator after the assessment session. Four types of actions were considered: (1) Changes to existing activities, (2) New activities, (3) Additional technical assistance, or (4) Advocacy, following the structure set out in the Guidelines.

Life-threatening Issues

Issue		Proposed Actions
Risk of fire	Construction methods	Reduce fire proneness and shift construction to less flammable materials. (Technical assistance may be needed for this action.)
	Concentration of people* ⁸	Establish fire breaks and fire prevention plans in camps. Ban cooking in shelters.
Conflict – conventional and unconventional warfare*		Advocate for an immediate cessation of fighting or peace zones around camps.
Fuel – danger of collectors		Implement activities to provide fuel in a safe manner to camp residents.
Lighting		Provide lighting within camps to improve security.
Disease – Human		Increase disease surveillance and preventive and curative activities.
Capacity to absorb waste		Increase waste collection and safe disposal, including recycling and composting, in ongoing and new sanitation activities.
Water	Opportunities for disease transmission	Immediately reduce opportunities for disease transmission due to standing water.
	Unsafe use of chemicals (some camps)	Implement standard safe handling and storage procedures in all locations.

⁸ * indicates that issue was mentioned in two different parts of the assessment, making it an issue of likely higher importance.

Sanitation	Avoidance of additional pollution (some camps)	Integrate waste reduction into assistance activities and increase recycling and composting.
	Increase in disease/vector transmission (some camps)	Remove standing water and other vector sites within camps.
	Avoiding the creation of hazardous waste sites (some camps)	Recycle and safely compost waste where possible. Expand health education to reduce the creation of hazardous waste sites.
Collecting wood and grass		Make the collection of fuel and grass safe. Provide fuel on a sustainable basis and alternate income sources if safe collection cannot be guaranteed.
Cooking – over harvesting of fuel		Make the collection of fuel safe so that the collection process can become sustainable.
Harvesting wild fruits		Make the collection safe so that the collection process can become sustainable.

Issues Affecting Welfare or the Environment

Issue	Action
Welfare	
Number of people affected	Reduce camp size.
Self-sufficiency	Increase self-sufficiency by introduction of livelihood-building activities.
Social Solidarity: Weak for some	Implement activities to increase social cohesion among IDPs.
Expectations	Communate with IDPs on limits to assistance.
Livelihood options	Implement livelihood-building activities.
Asset Distribution: Not equitable for all.	Improve food and NFI distribution methods to address unequal access.
Drought*	Introduction of drought-resistant farming methods and sustainable water supplies as part of post-conflict recovery activities.
Cooking - increased air pollution	Introduce fuel efficient stoves.
Sanitation – safe decommissioning of facilities	Integration of safe decommissioning into on-going sanitation activities and camp planning.
Duration of crisis	Advocacy to resolve the conflict.
Environment	
Unsustainable resource use	Introduction of sustainable resource management plans for camps.
Availability of natural resources (limited)	Increase area from which natural resources can be accessed.
Environmental Conditions (poor)	Incorporate activities to improve environmental conditions in the camps in other efforts (e.g., water, sanitation, camp management and planning).
Woodworking and other commercial activities	Provide training on sustainable resource use and recycling for productive activities.
Construction – use of scarce natural resources	Shift to less immediately exploitative use of natural resources, e.g., Use of earth construction instead of grass and wood; Use of metal bars to hold up plastic instead of wood.
Water – decommissioning facilities	Establish decommissioning plan and agreement with

	authorities and communities neighboring a camp before the camp is closed.
Water – overuse of ground or surface water supplies	Monitor and map ground water use and consider changing extraction methods, controls on use and sources of water to limit overuse of available supplies.

Given the short time for the assessment and the lack of easily accessible information, several issues could not be rated. These issues are listed below, and should be considered when additional information is available. These issues relate exclusively to the potential negative impacts of relief aid.

Wage Employment:

- Are IDP jobs in Nyala safe?
- Are IDP jobs based on sustainable resource extraction?

Agro-chemicals:

- Are dangers to applicators and other addressed?
- Are negative impacts on the ecology minimized?

Roads:

- Are procedures in place to prevent flooding and draining problems due to road work?

Relief supplies:

- Are steps taken to ensure relief is appropriate and acceptable to IDPs and will not be discarded?

Training:

- Are steps taken to ensure that new skills do not lead to greater extraction of resources or production of waste

Participant Review of the Assessment

At the end of the assessment session, participants were asked to answer the following seven questions. Responses and comments are provided to the right of the questions. Five reviews were received.

Question	Response	Comments
Was the session	Too short: 2	
	Just right : 3	For the time available to participants. Too short for a complete assessment
Were the rating forms clear and easy to complete?	Yes: 4	
	No: 1	Confusing
Were the instructions clear and to the point?	Yes: 5	
Did the results of the assessment indicate any issues or topics of importance which you were not previously aware?	Yes: 1	It provoked the Do No Harm while responding to the humanitarian situation.
	No: 4	
Did the assessment indicate any medium or long term issues of which you were not aware?	Yes: 1	The potential conflict over resources which may be left after the IDPs return.
	No: 4	
How would you rate the assessment?	Of some value: 2	Need to see final report.
	Of considerable value: 2	
Please provide suggestions for improving the Rea process or the assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •(Find) Different sources of funding which would allow inclusion of GOS participants. •Include more stakeholders •Missing Link: government contacts in sectors of environment, etc. •The views of the target beneficiaries (need) to be considered. •Go to the field. 	

Annex A

Context Statement

1. Provide three short paragraphs which summarize the (1) cause/s and most evident impacts of the disaster, (2) whether the weather or other conditions at the disaster site will change and if these changes will affect environmental conditions and relief needs, and (3) priority disaster relief efforts and specific programmatic areas of interest to the party completing the REA.

The immediate cause of the Darfur crisis is fighting between ethnically-defined groups. At one level, this fighting has its origins in past conflicts over access to natural resources, including land and water. The current conflict is more directly tied to the GOS response to attacks by dissident groups in Darfur. The initial attacks were intended to draw attention to local concerns that the allocation of power and resources within Sudan has not been equitable. The immediate result of the fighting has been:

- The displacement of over 1.5 million individuals (at least 1.3 million IDPs and .3 million refugees),
- The destruction of community and household assets in the communities attacked by GOS-aligned and SLA/JEM forces, and
- Considerable insecurity.

The large area affected, the disperse and only partially accessible affected populations and poor infrastructure all are making the delivery of relief assistance extremely difficult.

The rainy season is ending which should lead to improved ground access to displaced populations. As the dry season progresses, surface water sources will become more scarce and demand for water can be expected to increase. The area affected covers several agro-climatological zones, with corresponding differences in weather patterns and livelihoods systems. There are reports that drought has affected most of Darfur, which would have likely reduced food production and pasture availability even if the conflict-related crisis has not developed.

Current assistance priorities focus on the provision of the basic needs of water, food, shelter, basic sanitation, health care and protection. These needs are being met at levels estimated to be between approximately 60 and 18 per cent. Efforts are also underway to identify an appropriate stove for use in IDP camps to reduce the need for fuel. Although the origins of the conflict relate to fiscal and physical resource allocations and there are several current environmental issues (e.g., the needs for stoves, camp location and lay-out, destruction of productive assets) there is no focal point for environmental issue in the emergency coordinating structure. Planning on medium term environmental impacts (e.g., from drilling wells) has apparently not occurred.

2. What sources are likely to be able to provide information on the environment in the area affected by the disaster?

- Sustainable Development in Sudan: Ten Years After Rio Summit, H. A. A. Ati, Environmentalist Society, Khartoum and Heinrich Boll Foundation, Nairobi, 2002, and
- Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment, T. Caterson, USAID/REDSO/NPC and USAID/Sudan Task Force, Washington, 2003.

3. Have there been, or are there currently, concerns about the release of potentially toxic substances affecting humans or the environment?

Not reported.

4. Are there environmentally unique sites in the disaster area and have any been (or may be) affected directly or indirectly by the disaster?

None reported by IDPs. Gazetted forestes are reported in S. Darfur. Areas of unique natural value likely in S. Darfur, but not clearly identified. None are known to be near IDP camps.

5. Were there concerns about environmental conditions before the disaster? Briefly describe the nature and cause of the concern, and whether these concerns are linked to the current disaster.

None reported by IDPs during community assessments.

6. Are there any concerns about the environmental impact of the disaster on the part of the survivors or neighboring communities?

Yes. The general lack of natural resources and distance people need to go to get wood and other resources. There is a lack of information on overall environmental impacts of the crisis.

7. Are there any local or national laws, or donor or organizational policies and procedures which impact how environmental issues will be assessed or managed?

Most organizations waive environmental review rules during emergencies. Canada does require screening of projects at a stage earlier than for most other donors. Danida is also reported to require a review of environmental impacts of emergency assistance activities. USAID is instituting procedures which require an environmental screening of emergency food aid activities, although this is unlikely to affect WFP's assistance.

Rating Form 1: Factors Influencing Environmental Impacts

Ratings which are considered as high priority for intervention are in **bold**. Consensus on all ratings were not possible in the time available for the assessment. In some cases, the disagreement related to whether the **Factor** was being considered for IDP camps or the whole IDP population. Both ratings are indicated where there were disagreements, with the higher priority issue bolded and carried over to the assessment consolidation and analysis stage.

Factor	Rating
Number of persons affected (relative to total population in disaster area).	Many
Duration: Time since onset of disaster.	Months to years
Concentration of the affected population.	High
Distance disaster survivors have moved since the beginning of the disaster.	(Close to point of origin) Far from point of origin
Self-Sufficiency: After the start of the disaster, the ability of survivors to meet needs without recourse to additional direct extraction from the environment or external assistance.	Low
Social solidarity: Solidarity between disaster survivors and non-affected populations.	(Strong) Weak
Cultural homogeneity: The similarity of cultural beliefs and practices between disaster survivors and non-affected populations.	High
Asset distribution: The distribution of economic and other assets within disaster affected population after the start of the disaster.	(Equitable) Not Equitable
Livelihood options: The number of options that disaster survivors have to assure their livelihoods after the start of the disaster.	Few
Expectations: The level of assistance (local and external) which the disaster survivors expect to need to survive.	High
Availability of natural resources, or whether the available natural resources meet the needs of the disaster survivors in a way which can continue without degradation to the environment or future availability of the resources.	Low
Capacity to absorb waste: The environmental, social and physical structures available to handle waste produced by the survivors.	Low
Environmental Resilience: Ability of eco-system to rebound from the disaster itself and from relief and recovery activities which cause environmental damage.	Moderate

Rating Form 2: Environmental Threats of Disasters

Hazard	Physical area
Drought: Drying of Crops. Lack of water for normal crop development.	Large
Drought: Drying of water courses and lakes/ponds. 1. Lack of water supply for personal and commercial uses. 2. Increase health problems. 3. Decease in water quality. 4. Loss of income/food supply sources.	Large
Phytosanitary (Pest) Outbreak. Damage to economic crops from pests or disease.	Small (expecting locusts)
Disease. Human. Mortality and morbidity reducing social and economic activity and increasing personal hardship.	Large
Armed Conflict (between and within countries): Active fighting by military units (“conventional warfare”). Intentional damage to infrastructure, including power, water, sewage and industrial capacity due to active fighting. Limitations on ability to deliver basic supplies to non-combatant populations.	Large
Armed Conflict: Unconventional warfare (including terrorism and ethnic cleansing). Disruption of normal social and economic support systems (i.e., threat to ability of populations to meet basic needs). Damage to and disruption of infrastructure systems.	Large

Rating Form 3: Unmet Basic Needs

Where some of the IDP needs were being met, the level of assistance provided did not generally appear to be sustainable for one of the following reasons:

1. Uncertainty of funding,
2. Uncertainty of supply pipeline (particularly for food),
3. Uncertainty with respect to what is a sustainable level of resource use (related to the lack of information about the normal environment in S. Darfur).

Basic Needs	At present, are basic needs: * <i>Not met at all.</i> * <i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Greater part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Largely met.</i> * <i>Totally met.</i>	Indicators
Water	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 15 liters of water per person per day. 2. Waiting time at point of delivery not more than 15 minutes. 3. Distance from shelter to water point no more than 500 meters. 4. Water is palatable and of sufficient quality to be used without significant risk to health due to water-borne diseases, or chemical or radiological contamination during short-term use. (Note: contaminates includes human and industrial waste and agro-chemicals.)
Food	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimum food needs met : On average, 2,100 kilocalories per person per day, 10-12% of total energy from protein, 17% of total energy from fat, and adequate micro-nutrient intake. 2. Food supplies are accessible at affordable prices and supply and costs are stable over time. 3. Food distribution is equitable, transparent, safe and covers basic needs (together with other food items available).
Shelter	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 3.5 square meters of covered space per person providing protection from weather and fresh air, security

Basic Needs	At present, are basic needs: * <i>Not met at all.</i> * <i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Greater part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Largely met.</i> * <i>Totally met.</i>	Indicators
		<p>and privacy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>In hot climates</u>, shelter materials, construction and ventilation adequate to keep in-shelter temperature 10 degrees centigrade below outside temperature. 3. <u>In cold climates</u>, shelter material, construction, and heating ensure internal temperature no less than 15 degrees centigrade 4. Camps, temporary shelter sites or resettlement sites are safe and have adequate access to basic services. . 5. 45 square meters space is available per person in temporary camps or shelters, with provision made for living, social and commercial activities.
Personal Safety	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disaster survivors have sufficient personal liberty and security at all times. 2. Opportunities for violence are minimized to the extent possible. <p>Opportunities for violence should be noted and linked to specific environmental issues when appropriate.</p>
Health Care	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disaster survivors have adequate, timely and affordable access to care for injuries and health (including psychosocial) problems arising from the disaster. 2. Health management interventions are appropriate for chronic and acute health risks faced by disaster survivors and take into account age and gender. (See Sphere Standards for specifics.)
Waste management (liquid and solid)	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Toilets are clean and safe, with a maximum of 20 people per toilet and are no more than 50 meters from dwellings 2. Use of toilets is arranged by household(s) and/or segregated by sex. 3. Environment is acceptably free of solid waste contamination, including medical wastes. 4. Refuse containers are easily available and refuse is disposed of in a way to avoid creating health and environmental problems 5. No contaminated or dangerous medical wastes in living or public space.
Environmental Conditions	Not at all.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location of disaster survivors is not subject to immediate hazards, including flooding, pollution, landslides, fire, or volcanic eruptions, or effective mitigation measures have been taken. 2. Environment is free from risk of water erosion, from standing water and a slope of no more than 6%. 3. Smoke and fumes are below nuisance levels and pose no threat to human health. 4. Animal management minimizes opportunities for disease transmission, solid and liquid waste problems and environmental degradation. 5. Uncontrolled extraction of natural resources by disaster survivors is not taking place. 6. Graveyard (s) is appropriately located and sized.

Basic Needs	At present, are basic needs: * <i>Not met at all.</i> * <i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Greater part of needs met than not met.</i> * <i>Largely met.</i> * <i>Totally met.</i>	Indicators
Fuel	Not at all.	1. Fuel availability meets immediate needs. 2. Low smoke and fuel-efficient wood stoves, gas or kerosene stoves and cooking pots with well-fitting lids are available.
Lighting	Not at all.	Sufficient to meet security requirements and for normal economic and social activities.
Domestic Resources	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	Each household unit has access to adequate utensils, soap for personal hygiene and necessary tools. (Specific minimum needs identified in Sphere Handbook Chapter 4, Section 2).
Clothing	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i>	Clothing is appropriate for climatic conditions, gender, age, safety, dignity, and well-being.
Transport	<i>Lesser part of needs met than not met.</i> (both the IDPs and NGOs)	1. Adequate to deliver goods and services to displaced at reasonable cost and convenience. 2. Adequate to permit disaster survivors to reach goods and services at reasonable cost and convenience.

Rating Form 4: Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities

The answer to the question on whether potential negative environmental consequences have been addressed was not clear in some cases, and is so marked in the 3rd column. These activities require the collection of additional information.

Other questions could be answered yes for some locations (e.g., certain IDP camps) but no for other locations. This difference is noted in the third column. "No" answers are carried forward to the priority list of issues, but with an indication that they may be addressed in some locations or by some assistance programs.

Activities in Response to the Crisis	Questions on whether potential negative environmental consequences of proposed interventions have been addressed.	Yes/No answer to the question immediately to the left.
Collecting wood and grass	Is the collection of wood and grass being done in a sustainable manner?	No
Wage employment	1. Are the jobs filled by IDPs safe?	Unclear
	2. Are the jobs filled by IDPs based on sustainable resource extraction?	Unclear
Woodworking, making mats	In the collection of raw materials being done in a sustainable manner?	No
Sewing, food production and other commercial activities.	Are these activities being conducted without any significant negative impact on the environment?	Unclear
Agro-chemicals	1. Is the danger to applicators and humans from exposure in the application, handling or storage of agro-chemicals addressed?	Unclear
	2. Are negative impacts on non-target organisms in soil, water and air avoided or minimized?	Unclear
Harvesting wild plants/fruits	Are steps taken to avoid harvesting rates which exceed production capacity or reduces future production capacity?	No
Construction, including shelter, public buildings and infrastructure excluding roads.	1. Are plans and procedures established to prevent scarce natural resources from being over exploited for construction activities?	No
	2. Are plans and procedures established to ensure that the construction site is not in an area of increased hazard compared to location or conditions before disaster?	Yes
	3. Are plans and procedures in place to avoid increases risk of flooding, erosion or other hazards due to the construction?	Yes
	4. Do construction methods and procedures take into account the risks such as fire and conflict?	No
Water Supply	1. Do plans exist for decommissioning water installations?	No
	2. Are increased opportunities for disease transmission avoided?	No
	3. Are there plans and procedures to avoid an increase in population density having a negative environmental impact?	Yes
	4. Is the overuse of ground or surface water supplies avoided?	No
	5. Are chemicals used to clean or purify water managed in such a way to avoid human health dangers or contamination of the environment?	Yes in areas/No in others

Activities in Response to the Crisis	Questions on whether potential negative environmental consequences of proposed interventions have been addressed.	Yes/No answer to the question immediately to the left.
Sanitation, including latrines, waste treatment and transport infrastructure, and solid waste management.	1. Do plans exist for decommissioning sanitary installations?	No
	2. Is the creation of hazardous waste sites avoided?	No in places
	3. Is additional pollution of land, water and air avoided?	No in places
	4. Is an increase in disease transmission and presence of disease vectors avoided?	No in places
Health Care	1. Is pollution from disposal of medical and other waste avoided?	Yes
	2. Is an increased demand for traditional medical herbs and plants which exceeds sustainable yield avoided?	Unclear
Change in cooking or food processing procedures.	1. Is increased fuel harvesting avoided or mitigated?	No
	2. Is increased air pollution avoided?	No
Relief Supplies	1. Are steps taken to ensure that relief packaging does not create a solid waste disposal problem?	Yes
	2. Are steps taken to ensure that personal hygiene materials are disposed of properly and pose no health and sanitation problem?	Yes
	3. Are steps taken to ensure that relief assistance is appropriate or acceptable to survivors and not discarded?	Yes
	4. Are there procedures to ensure that relief does not create new and unsustainable consumption habits on part of survivors?	Yes
Training	Are steps taken to ensure that new skills learned do not lead to greater extraction of resources or production of waste?	Unclear

Nyala Rating Form – Critical Issues – Raw Data

Issue	Importance (Affecting Life, Welfare or the Environment)
Context	
Conflict	L
Drought	W
Unsustainable resource use	E
Factors	
Number of people affected	W
Duration of crisis	W
Concentration (in camps)	L
Distance traveled (but not by all)	W
Self-sufficiency	W
Social Solidarity (weak for some)	W
Asset Distribution (not equitable for all)	W
Livelihood options	W
Expectations	W
Availability of natural resources	E
Capacity to absorb waste	L
Environmental Threats	
Drought – drying of crops	W
Drought - drying of water supplies	W

Disease – Human	L
Armed Conflict – conventional and unconventional	L
Unmet Needs	
Environmental Conditions	E
Fuel	L
Lighting	L
(All other are lesser part of needs met)	
Negative Consequences of Relief	
Collecting wood and grass	L
Woodworking and other commercial activities	L
Harvesting wild fruits	L
Construction – use of scarce natural resources	E
Construction – risk of fire	L
Water – decommissioning facilities	E
Water – opportunities for disease transmission	L
Water – overuse of ground or surface water supplies	E
Water – unsafe use of chemicals (some locations)	L
Sanitation – decommissioning of facilities	W
Sanitation – avoiding creation of hazardous waste sited (some locations)	L
Sanitation – avoidance of additional pollution (no in places)	L
Sanitation – increase in disease/vector transmission (no in places)	L
Cooking – over harvesting of fuel	L
Cooking - increased air pollution	W

Annex B Proposed Schedule

Task	Minutes	Start	Stop
<i>Introduction</i>	5	1100	1105
<i>Context</i>	10	1105	1115
<i>Form 1 – Factors</i>	20	1115	1135
<i>Form 2 – Disaster Impact</i>	20	1135	1155
<i>Form 3 – Unmet Needs</i>	20	1155	1215
<i>Form 4 – Relief Impact</i>	20	1215	1235
<i>Consolidation and Actions</i>	25	1235	1300

Introduction

Why is there a need to include environmental issues in emergency response?

Disasters can lead to environmental problems.

Environmental conditions can contribute to disasters.

Relief assistance can have a negative or positive impact on the environment.

Normal environmental impact assessment procedures are not appropriate for disasters or other crisis situations.

What is the REA?

The REA is a structured, subjective, consensus based assessment process which brings together the environmental concerns of (1) Assistance providers and (2) Affected populations.

The assessment at the level of assistance providers (IOs, Donors, NGOs, government) requires approximately 4 hours (but we'll do it in 2) in one sitting. Regular follow-up meetings are useful in tracking progress on addressing issues and revising the REA to take into account changes in the crisis situation.

A REA assessment generates a prioritized list of critical issues which can be addressed by (1) Simple fixes, (2) New projects, (3) Technical support, or (4) Advocacy. Since the environment cuts a wide swath, the output of an REA typically covers a wide range of issues linked to the immediate response as well as the medium term.

The focus of the Real Time REA will be on (1) identifying solutions to current environment-disaster issues and (2) identifying how these types of issues will change over the next 3 to 6 months.

Community assessment work has been done in Kalma (2 WatSan committees) and Otash (1 WatSan committee) camps. Additional work is planned in other camps.

The Process

One Context Statement, four rating forms and two consolidation and analysis tables. Each steps will involve a review of the written materials, discussions and consensus decisions as to the issues identified. Not a complete assessment, a rapid assessment to identify what to focus on now and what to consider focusing on in the future.

Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment – Darfur Community Level Assessment – South Darfur

Prepared by: C. Kelly, Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment Project⁹

Summary

Discussions with four groups of IDPs in three camps (one urban, one peri-urban and one rural) in South Darfur identified a number of environment-related issues arising from the Darfur conflict and specifically from the displacement of large numbers of individuals. Critical issues identified include:

- The need to stop the conflict, or at least increase the zone of safety around IPD camps,
- Increase the supply of food and potable water,

⁹. Contact: 72734.2412@compuserve.com

- Expand and improve sanitation and waste management to limit negative health outcomes and environmental damage, and,
- Increase IDP livelihood options (which will have positive impact on food and other basic needs and may reduce the demand for local natural resources).

Introduction

This report covers information collected from communities as part of the Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment for the Darfur crisis. The report contains transcribed answers to community impact assessment questions, a tabulation of the results using a **Community Assessment Summary Form** and a summary of salient results from the assessment (following section). Procedures set out in the Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment¹⁰ were followed in conducting the community assessments and analyzing the results.

The community assessments were conducted between 25 and 28 September in the Kalma, Otash (GOS areas) and Bajoum (SLA area) IDP camps, South Darfur. The Kalma and Otash assessments were facilitated by CARE International Sudan. The Bajoum assessment was facilitated by Norwegian Church Aid/ACT.

CARE and NCA identified the IPD groups who participated in the assessment. These groups were, in all four cases, local water and sanitation committees. The groups were composed of men (generally more) and women (generally less). Steps were taken to solicit responses from both genders. Local NGO staff were used to translate the questions and responses. A “walk around” was also conducted in each camp as part of the assessment.

The assessments should not be taken as a statistically significant or representative of the full IDP situation in South Darfur, but rather the collection of environment-related information from IDPs in rural, peri-urban and urban locations, and from small, medium and large camps. The three camps surveyed do, however, appear to represent the typical situation for the respective types of camps in South Darfur.

The number of community assessments were limited by the time available for the overall Darfur REA. Particularly in Kalma camp but also in Otash, discussion during the assessment tended to turn to complaints about the conditions which created the IDP situation. It is likely that the assessment meetings were treated as an opportunity to present grievances on the part of the IDPs.

The results of this assessment will be combined with the results of organizational level assessments conducted in Khartoum and Nyala. A separate report will be provide the synthesis of these three assessments, and also consider institutional issues.

Summary of Results

The following table summarizes the environment-related issues which were most frequently mentioned during the community assessments. Only those issues mentioned by three or more of the groups are included here. These issues are ranked according to impact of life, welfare or the environment. Suggested ways to address the issues are identified.

The most salient issues in a particular camp, or for a particular group of IDPs, may differ from the list below. Specifically, differences in livelihoods options exist between urban/peri-urban and rural camps, as apparently do the scope and actual levels of assistance provided. Actual assistance in a location and for a specific population should be based on site-specific assessments.

Issue	Suggested Actions
<i>Issues With an Immediate Impact of Life</i>	
Conflict	Advocacy to stop fighting.
Inadequate personal safety	Create safe zone around IDP areas

¹⁰. http://www.benfieldhrc.org/SiteRoot/disaster_studies/rea/rea_index.htm

Inadequate potable water		Increase potable water supplies.
Inadequate food		Increase food supplies, as food aid or as income for purchase in local markets in urban and peri-urban areas.
Limited livelihood base		Diversify livelihood base.
Sanitation	Inadequate control of insects and breeding sites Inappropriate waste management	Expand waste management activities for greater impact and coverage. Eliminate vector breeding sites through liquid and solid waste management. Reduce waste production and increase recycling.
	Limited capacity to absorb	
<i>Issues with an Immediate Impact on Welfare or the Environment</i>		
Concentration of IDPs		Reduce density of camps.
IDPs have moved a great distance		Provide assistance to IDPs to limit recourse to environment.
Low self-sufficiency		Increase livelihood options.
Low culturally homogeneity		Initiate conflict management activities within camps.
Inadequate fuel		Provide safe access to sustainable fuel supplies.
Inadequate household resources		Increase household resources.
Large number of persons affected		Advocate for an ending of the conflict.
Length of the disaster		Advocate for an ending of the conflict.
High expectations		Provide IDPs with accurate information on expected and requested assistance levels.
Resource Use	Construction of camp facilities using scarce local resources. Limited environmental resilience Current resource use will reduce future availability Possible excessive harvesting of wood and grass	Implement resource management plans to match use to sustainable resource availability.

Community Assessment Summary Form

#	Item/Question	Kalma Sector B center Z	Kalma Sector A Center	Otash, Nivala	Bajourn	Ranking ¹¹
Context Questions: Score Yes = 1 (“bad”) or No = 0. Corresponds to Sections One and Two of the Organization Level Assessment .						
1	Did the community report environmental concerns?	0	0	0	0	0
2	Did the community report environmental problems?	1	0	1	0	2
3	Are there unique areas near the community?	0	-	0	1	1
4	Are a large number of persons affected by the disaster?	1	1	1	0	3
5	Has the disaster been going on for a long time?	1	1	1	0	3
6	Are the disaster survivors concentrated?	1	1	1	0	3
7	Have the survivors moved a great distance?	1	1	1	1	4
8	Is level of self-sufficiency low?	1	1	1	1	4
9	Is social solidarity low?	0	0	0	0	0
10	Is culturally homogeneity low?	1	1	1	1	4
11	Are most assets concentrated with a few individuals?	0	0	0	0	0
12	Is livelihood base limited (not diversified)?	1	1	1	1	4
13	Are expectations high?	1	1	1	0	3
14	Will current resource use reduce adequate availability in the future?	1	1	1	0	3
15	Is capacity to absorb waste limited?	1	1	1	0	3
16	Does the environment have limited resilience?	1	1	1	0	3
Disasters/Hazards, Yes = 1 (“bad”) or No = 0. Corresponds to Section Three of Organization Level Assessment .						
17	Is drought a reported problem?	0	0	0	1	1
18	Is wildfire a reported problem?	0	0	0	0	0

¹¹ The importance ranking is calculated by adding the number of similar answers based on one answer (e.g. yes) being 1 and the other 0.

19	Is conflict a reported problem?	1	1	1	1	4
20	Is animal disease a reported problem?	0	0	0	1	1
21	Is human disease a reported problem?	0	0	0	0	0
22	Are other hazards reported problems (note response for each hazard separately).	0	0	0	0	0
Unmet Needs No = 1 (“bad”) or Yes = 0. Corresponds to Section Four of the Organization Level Assessment .						
23	Are adequate supplies of potable water available for humans?	1	1	0	1	3
24	Are adequate supplies of potable water available for animals?	1	1	0	1	3
25	Is shelter adequate for local expectations?	1	1	1	0	1
26	Is food adequate?	1	1	1	1	4
27	Is fuel adequate?	1	1	1	0	4
28	Are household resources adequate?	1	1	1	1	4
29	Is personal safety adequate?	1	1	1	1	4
30	Are human health conditions adequate?	0	0	1	1	2
31	Is waste management appropriate?	1	1	1	1	4
32	Is the control of insects and breeding sites adequate?	1	1	0	1	3
32	Are agro-chemicals used safely?	1	1	0	-	2
Strategy/Action		Indicate Positive (+) or Negative (-) Impact on Local Environment		Comments including whether the action is common for all or only a select number of communities or groups within the communities.		
Harvesting wood		+/-		Depends on harvest rate is sustainable. More likely to be the case in rural than urban or peri-urban areas.		
Harvesting grass		+/-		Depends on harvest rate and season.		
Wage labor in urban and peri-urban areas.		+/-		Depends on type of labor.		
Domestic labor		Neutral				
Small scale manufacturing: mats, beds using local resources		+/-		Depends if harvest rate of raw materials is sustainable.		
Wage (food or cash) labor in camps for NGOs.		Generally neutral.		May involve unsustainable resource use (e.g., building grass and wood buildings) and should be monitored.		

IDP Camp REA Information

A. General Information

1. Date: 9/22/2004
2. Time Started: 1430
3. Time End: 1540
4. Name of Camp and Group: Kalma, Sector B, Center 7.
5. Group composition: 3 women; 4 men.
6. Person/s conducting the assessment: Kelly, translator: Adam
7. Distance of camp from main road and state capital: 20 km
8. Nature of access to the camp: sand track.
9. Ethnic group/s and religion diversity present in the camp: Fur, Zarawa, Msalit, Dajo, Bilgit
10. Description of the camp. Unplanned settlement. Clusters of huts, market, NGOs services spread out through camp.
11. Description of the origin of the camp: Reported to have been established in August 2003 for people displaced by local fighting who had been in Nyala. Camp continues to grow. Composed of different ethnic groups in mixed neighborhoods in camp.
12. Number of people currently in the camp: 80,000.

B. Environment and Livelihood Information

Environment

13. How does the group describe the environment in which the camp is located?

Uninteresting, hot, no trees, not enough food.

14. Is the camp near any unique environmental areas (e.g., national park, industrial site)?

No.

15. Are there any areas which the group considers as special, such as holy sites, locations of natural resources or places which are protected by tradition? (Where possible, identify exact location.)

Not asked.

16. Does the group have any specific concerns about the environment? Specifically ask about fire, drought, floods, water and air pollution and other hazards, and recent changes to environmental conditions.

Lack of fire wood. Not enough wood near camp. Collecting fire wood unsafe.

17. Does the group see the location of the camp as one that is safe from floods, erosion, and other problems?

No, camp unsafe, particularly after incident at CARE when things were lost and people arrested.

18. What are the rules that the group has governing the use of natural resources (agriculture land, forests, pasture, water)? Is there any difference for males and females?

Not asked.

19. How does the group resolve a dispute over the use of natural resources (forest, pasture or land use) water or other natural resources?

Not asked.

20. Have group members faced any problems with neighboring communities in terms of collecting wood, water or food?

No. Neighboring communities abandoned. Some living in camp. Security and gov a problem.

Livelihood/ economic activities

21. Nature of livelihood system before coming to the camp: herding, agro-pastoral, farming, industry, other wage labor (indicate what type of labor). Indicate if more than one system is used, and number 1 to 5 in terms of importance.

(1) Farming, (2) animals (large and small).

22. What are major current ways of getting income and who among family members are involved? Describe major occupation in terms of importance.

Collecting wood/grass; working for NGO, market.

23. What is the wealth diversity in the group? Do (1) most families have about the same wealth, (2) are there a lot of poor and a few wealthy families in the group, or (3) are there some poor and wealthy, but most families have sufficient resources for all needs?

Equal.

24. Are families supported by only one type of work, or by several family members with different occupations?

Same.

C. Disaster Information

25. Has the group been affected by any of the following events in the past year.
Crop pests or diseased, Animal diseases, Conflict, Drought

Comments below refer to conflict. In terms of drought, response was that people aided each other. Limited outside assistance was received. Although crop pests and animal diseases were mentioned, not specifics were provided.

26. What was the cause and impact of the disaster?

Loss of lives, animals and possessions. Need to flee to camps.

27. What damage happened as a result? Describe human and material damages.

Homes burnt, animals stolen, people killed and injured.

28. How many people have left the community due to the disaster, where did they go and when are they expected back?

All. Most to camp, some to town.

29. When did the disaster start and how long is it expected to continue?

Varied. Some moved as long ago as July.

30. Has the type of work that people do to support families changed since the start of the disaster? If yes, note changes.

Yes. Can't farm.

31. What has the group done to address the disaster? What coping mechanisms have been used?

Moved. Got assistance from "parents".

32. Since the disaster began, how do people in the group get money and have these sources changed? (List sources and changes.)

Collecting and selling wood and grass. Work for NGOs.

33. Has the group been able to address (1) most, (2) some, (3) few of the impacts of the disaster from their own resources?

Few.

34. Has the group received any assistance from the government or NGOs to deal with the disaster? (Yes/no). If no, skip to number 38.

Yes.

35. What kind of assistance was received? (List, including origin – government, donor, NGO, other communities, people who have left the group-- if possible)

Water and sanitation: CARE

Food: WFP

Other assistance not mentioned.

NFI distributions were done but participants said they didn't receive assistance.

Problem expressed that people from Nyala were coming to camp to get assistance.

36. Was this assistance considered to be (1) a lot of assistance, (2) enough assistance, (3) just some assistance, (3) little assistance?

Little.

37. Has this assistance (1) improved, (2) stabilized or (3) not had much impact on conditions in the group?

Not much impact.

38. Has the assistance which has been provided caused any problems for the group? (Prompt for impact on the environment.)

Assistance not equal. Not all people can get cards due to other demands.

39. When the disaster is over, how long does the group think it will for things to return to normal?

Not possible to forget. 25 to 50 years when there is a new generation.

40. What is necessary for the group to return to their communities?

Safety, peace, get back what has been lost (in cash or kind).

D. Basic Needs

41. How does the group get water: purchase, wells, cisterns, lakes, ponds etc.? (Indicate more than one if needed)

Wells and bladders.

42. How does the group describe the water quality?

Wells: not so good - salty; bladders: good.

43. Is there enough water for everyone in the group?

No. People have to wait to get water; sources are not close enough. Problem for elderly.

44. What types of shelter does the group use?

Plastic or grass huts

45. How did group members get materials to build a shelter?

From forest.

46. How does the group meet their needs for clothing?

What they have on their backs, gifts from parents.

47. How will additional clothing be secured: purchase, manufacture, and/or gift?

Gift. Reported no NFI.

48. How do group members get food: own production, purchasing in market, gift etc.? (Indicate importance if more than one source.)

Food aid, purchase. Priority source differed among participants.

49. Do all the group members have enough food? If not, who is most affected by the lack of food?

No. All.

50. How does the group get fuel for cooking and other uses? (purchase, free collection, other means – note)

Forest.

51. Have group members lost any household resources (utensils, soap for personal hygiene, bedding, tools etc.) due to the disaster?

Yes. Close to all.

52. How will these be replaced: sale of assets, gift, purchase, etc?

Gift, purchase, aid.

53. Do people in the group have any concerns about personal safety, either in the group or when outside the group? If yes, who is affected and why?

Yes. Men.

54. Is there adequate health care for the group?

No.

55. Is health care free, including drugs?

Yes.

56. If health care is not free, how do group members pay the costs involved?

--

57. Does the group use latrines? If yes, indicate their type, location and ownership (family, group of families, communal).

Some do, some don't. Depends on whether latrines are available.

58. Are there enough latrines?

No.

59. If no, why people do not have them?

No time to build enough.

60. Is there any agro-chemicals use in the camp? If yes, note type, sources and for what purpose the agro-chemicals are used.

Yes.

61. Have agro-chemical users received training on safe use?

Yes.

62. Is the group aware of the dangers of excessive application of agro-chemicals?

Somewhat.

E. Conclusion

63. How would the group describe a good future for the group? (Prompt for types of work, types of housing, access to water, electricity, roads, education and health status and changes to the environment.)

Safety and peace, whether they stay in the camp or return to their homes.

64. What suggestions do group members make as to how environmental issues in the group should be addressed?

Need firewood (supplies running out); spaying against bugs; shade (plastic hot)

F. Coping Strategies

65. If not indicated elsewhere during discussions with the group, note specific coping strategies which are being used in response to the disaster.

Collecting wood and grass, constructing goods from wood/grass, trade.

G. Observations

Observation should be made as to the way that human, animal and other waste is disposed.

66. Is the area near the group meeting clean of human/animal waste and garbage? (yes/no).

No.

67. Are waste sites (where people throw waste or use as a toilet) distant from the camp? (yes/no).

None noted.

68. Are there obvious insect breeding sites (particularly for flies and mosquitoes) in the camp? (yes/no).

Yes.

69. Is the camp graveyard distant from housing and water supplies?

Not noted.

70. If there is a health facility in the camp are medical wastes disposed of safely? (yes/no)

Not ascertained.

IDP Camp REA Information

A. General Information

1. Date: 9/22/2004
2. Time Started: 1300
3. Time End: 1410
4. Name of Camp and Group: Sector A, Center 7,
5. Group composition: 2-3 women, 3-4 men
6. Person/s conducting the assessment: Kelly, Adam translator
7. Distance of camp from main road and state capital: 20 km
8. Nature of access to the camp: sand track
9. Ethnic group/s and religion diversity present in the camp: Fur, Zarawa, Msalit, Dajo, Bilgit
10. Description of the camp. Unplanned settlement. Clusters of huts, market, NGOs services spread out through camp.
11. Description of the origin of the camp: Reported to have been established in August 2003 for people displaced by local fighting who had been in Nyala. Camp continues to grow. Composed of different ethnic groups in mixed neighborhoods in camp.
12. Number of people currently in the camp: 80,000.

B. Environment and Livelihood Information

Environment

13. How does the group describe the environment in which the camp is located?

Ok but problems with health, food, water, sanitation.

14. Is the camp near any unique environmental areas (e.g., national park, industrial site)?

No clear answer.

15. Are there any areas which the group considers as special, such as holy sites, locations of natural resources or places which are protected by tradition?

No clear answer.

16. Does the group have any specific concerns about the environment?

Group spoke about concerns that chiefs were being paid to encourage people to return to villages.

17. Does the group see the location of the camp as one that is safe from floods, erosion, and other problems?

If there is no protection (security) there will be problems.

18. What are the rules that the group has governing the use of natural resources (agriculture land, forests, pasture, water)? Is there any difference for males and females?

No on living outside camp so no problems. No explicit rules seem to exist.

19. How does the group resolve a dispute over the use of natural resources (forest, pasture or land use) water or other natural resources?

No answered.

20. Have group members faced any problems with neighboring communities in terms of collecting wood, water or food?

No one is living outside camp.

Livelihood/ economic activities

21. Nature of livelihood system before coming to the camp: herding, agro-pastoral, farming, industry, other wage labor (indicate what type of labor). Indicate if more than one system is used, and number 1 to 5 in terms of importance.

1) Farming, 2) raising animals.

22. What are major current ways of getting income and who among family members are involved? Describe major occupation in terms of importance.

Before war: sell sorghum. Sell animals (less often).

Now: collection and selling wood and grass from around camp.

23. What is the wealth diversity in the group? Do (1) most families have about the same wealth, (2) are there a lot of poor and a few wealthy families in the group, or (3) are there some poor and wealthy, but most families have sufficient resources for all needs?

Equal.

24. Are families supported by only one type of work, or by several family members with different occupations?

Generally one type (wood/grass collection), also NGO work for skilled, some trading.

C. Disaster Information

25. Has the group been affected by any of the following events in the past year.

Discussion focused on conflict.

26. What was the cause and impact of the disaster?

Attacks on villages. Loss of lived, good, buildings, possessions.

27. What damage happened as a result? Describe human and material damages.

See 25.

28. How many people have left the community due to the disaster, where did they go and when are they expected back?

All. To camp via Nyala, or directly.

29. When did the disaster start and how long is it expected to continue?

Up to 12 months ago.

30. Has the type of work that people do to support families changed since the start of the disaster? If yes, note changes.

Now collection of wood/grass, making goods, small trade, work for NGOs

31. What has the group done to address the disaster? What coping mechanisms have been used?

Migration/flight, Gifts, selling food aid.

32. Since the disaster began, how do people in the group get money and have these sources changed? (List sources and changes.)

Selling wood/forest products, food aid.

33. Has the group been able to address (1) most, (2) some, (3) few of the impacts of the disaster from their own resources?

Few.

34. Has the group received any assistance from the government or NGOs to deal with the disaster? (Yes/no). If no, skip to number 38.

Yes.

35. What kind of assistance was received? (List, including origin – government, donor, NGO, other communities, people who have left the group-- if possible)

Water and sanitation: CARE; Food: WFP, other assistance indicated but sources not identified. (There are clinics and other services being provided to camp.)

36. Was this assistance considered to be (1) a lot of assistance, (2) enough assistance, (3) just some assistance, (3) little assistance?

Little

37. Has this assistance (1) improved, (2) stabilized or (3) not had much impact on conditions in the group?

Not had much impact.

38. Has the assistance which has been provided caused any problems for the group? (Prompt for impact on the environment.)

Problem with people who come from Nyala to get aid.

39. When the disaster is over, how long does the group think it will for things to return to normal? 10 – 20 years.

40. What is necessary for the group to return to their communities?

Safety, peace, recover what has been lost - \$. Blood money from government (answer to prompt)

D. Basic Needs

41. How does the group get water: purchase, wells, cisterns, lakes, ponds etc.? Indicate more than one if needed)

Well, bladders.

42. How does the group describe the water quality?

Well: not good; Bladder: good, Prefer taste of chlorine.

43. Is there enough water for everyone in the group?

No.

44. What types of shelter does the group use?

Plastic and thatch.

45. How did group members get materials to build a shelter?

Forest/around camp.

46. How does the group meet their needs for clothing?

Lost most during flight.

47. How will additional clothing be secured: purchase, manufacture, and/or gift?

Gift, purchase

48. How do group members get food: own production, purchasing in market, gift etc.? (Indicate importance if more than one source.)

1) Purchase, 2) food aid

49. Do all the group members have enough food? If not, who is most affected by the lack of food?

No.

50. How does the group get fuel for cooking and other uses? (purchase, free collection, other means – note)

Forest, some buy charcoal or wood.

51. Have group members lost any household resources (utensils, soap for personal hygiene, bedding, tools etc.) due to the disaster?

Yes.

52. How will these be replaced: sale of assets, gift, purchase, etc?

Want to be repaid for losses.

53. Do people in the group have any concerns about personal safety, either in the group or when outside the group? If yes, who is affected and why?

Yes. All.

54. Is there adequate health care for the group?

Not enough.

55. Is health care free, including drugs?

Yes.

56. If health care is not free, how do group members pay the costs involved?

57. Does the group use latrines? If yes, indicate their type, location and ownership (family, group of families, communal).

Yes. Family or communal.

58. Are there enough latrines?

No.

59. If no, why people do not have them?

No yet constructed.

60. Is there any agro-chemicals use in the camp? If yes, note type, sources and for what purpose the agro-chemicals are used.

Yes.

61. Have agro-chemical users received training on safe use?

Unclear.

62. Is the group aware of the dangers of excessive application of agro-chemicals?

Instructions to prevent contamination provided when huts were sprayed.

E. Conclusion

63. How would the group describe a good future for the group? (Prompt for types of work, types of housing, access to water, electricity, roads, education and health status and changes to the environment.)

Help from international community. Going back to communities.

64. What suggestions do group members make as to how environmental issues in the group should be addressed?

More assistance – camp is growing. Winter is coming – need clothes, better shelter. Malaria increasing. Want more spraying.

F. Coping Strategies

65. If not indicated elsewhere during discussions with the group, note specific coping strategies which are being used in response to the disaster.

Charcoal making, NGO work, trading.

G. Observations

Observation should be made as to the way that human, animal and other waste is disposed.

66. Is the area near the group meeting clean of human/animal waste and garbage? (yes/no).

No.

67. Are waste sites (where people throw waste or use as a toilet) distant from the camp? (yes/no).

None noted.

68. Are there obvious insect breeding sites (particularly for flies and mosquitoes) in the camp? (yes/no).

Yes.

69. Is the camp graveyard distant from housing and water supplies?

Not known.

70. If there is a health facility in the camp are medical wastes disposed of safely? (yes/no)

To be confirmed.

IDP Camp REA Information

A. General Information

1. Date: 25 September 2004
2. Time Started: 1125
3. Time End: 1230
4. Name of Camp and Group: Otash, on north side of Nyala.
5. Group composition: Initially 10 men/4 women. Group grew considerably during session
6. Distance of camp from main road and state capital: At state capital.
7. Person/s conducting the assessment: Kelly, Mariam
8. Nature of access to the camp: paved road to dirt track.
9. Ethnic group/s and religion diversity present in the camp: Zagawa, Fur, Birgit, Mtalit, Tinjur.
10. Description of the camp. Spontaneous unplanned settlement on outskirts of Nyala. 2 hospitals, water and limited sanitation provision, minimal shelter, other NGO-based facilities being established. Next to established "squatter" settlement. Some "ghost" housing by IDPs who are not normally resident in camp. General quality of housing is very poor and crowded. Camp has market and is easily accessible from Nyala.
11. Description of the origin of the camp: Reported established on March 04, with influxes in May, June, July, August and September.
12. Number of people currently in the camp: 17,000

B. Environment and Livelihood Information

Environment

13. How does the group describe the environment in which the camp is located?
Before CARE came to the camp, conditions were bad, with poor sanitation. Now things are better. The collection of garbage and smoke are problems.
14. Is the camp near any unique environmental areas (e.g., national park, industrial site)?
Town.
15. Are there any areas which the group considers as special, such as holy sites, locations of natural resources or places which are protected by tradition? (Where possible, identify exact location.)
None reported.
16. Does the group have any specific concerns about the environment?
In camp, no problems, but would like more space, better sanitation, latrines, and schools.
Around camp, people can be attacked if they go beyond 1 km. In general, men only venture to town.
Attacks on women reported.
17. Does the group see the location of the camp as one that is safe from floods, erosion, and other problems?
See #16.
18. What are the rules that the group has governing the use of natural resources (agriculture land, forests, pasture, water)? Is there any difference for males and females?
Not answered.
19. How does the group resolve a dispute over the use of natural resources (forest, pasture or land use) water or other natural resources?
Discussion focused on problems with Janjaweed.
20. Have group members faced any problems with neighboring communities in terms of collecting wood, water or food?
See #16, 19.

Livelihood/ economic activities

21. Nature of livelihood system before coming to the camp:
(1) Farming, (2) animals. Also shops and skilled labor, but of lesser importance.
22. What are major current ways of getting income and who among family members are involved?
Describe major occupation in terms of importance.
Making mats (women), domestic work/laundry in Nyala, digging and other manual labor (men). Collecting and selling wood.
23. What is the wealth diversity in the group?
Relatively diverse.

24. Are families supported by only one type of work, or by several family members with different occupations?

Limited range of jobs, mostly collection of wood/grass, making mats or low wage work in Nyala. Men and women look for work.

C. Disaster Information

25. Has the group been affected by any of the following events in the past year.

Discussion focused on conflict.

26. What was the cause and impact of the disaster?

Janjaweed attacks.

27. What damage happened as a result?

Loss of assets: deaths and injuries, loss of housing and farming equipment, loss of animals.

28. How many people have left the community due to the disaster, where did they go and when are they expected back?

All.

29. When did the disaster start and how long is it expected to continue?

February 04, and subsequently for some communities. No expected end indicated.

30. Has the type of work that people do to support families changed since the start of the disaster? If yes, note changes.

Limited work, largely different from previous occupations. People largely dependent on relief and limited commercial activities.

31. What has the group done to address the disaster? What coping mechanisms have been used?

Left villages. Came to camp for assistance. Collect and sell wood and grass. Look for jobs.

32. Since the disaster began, how do people in the group get money and have these sources changed?

See #31.

33. Has the group been able to address (1) most, (2) some, (3) few of the impacts of the disaster from their own resources?

Not enough

34. Has the group received any assistance from the government or NGOs to deal with the disaster?

Yes.

35. What kind of assistance was received?

GOS: food (sorghum, sugar, tea, oil, plastic sheeting).

WFP: One distribution (not all have distribution cards).

IRC & WVI: Hospitals/clinics (one each)

CARE and Unicef: Water, sanitation/latrines, bathing platforms (not completed)

36. Was this assistance considered to be (1) a lot of assistance, (2) enough assistance, (3) just some assistance, (3) little assistance?

Not enough, except water.

37. Has this assistance (1) improved, (2) stabilized or (3) not had much impact on conditions in the group?

"Still here" (needing assistance). Still need clothes. (Answer presume to be "stabilized")

38. Has the assistance which has been provided caused any problems for the group?

Yes. Camp becoming unhappy because not all people are getting aid. (Reportedly some are not registered.)

39. When the disaster is over, how long does the group think it will for things to return to normal?

Uncertain.

40. What is necessary for the group to return to their communities?

Change on GOS policies. Get losses back. Peace.

D. Basic Needs

41. How does the group get water: purchase, wells, cisterns, lakes, ponds etc.? Indicate more than one if needed)

Bladder, hand pumps.

42. How does the group describe the water quality?

Good from bladder, salty from hand pumps.

43. Is there enough water for everyone in the group?
Yes.
44. What types of shelter does the group use?
Huts, made of local materials, some with plastic.
45. How did group members get materials to build a shelter?
Surrounding areas.
46. How does the group meet their needs for clothing?
Can't. Want more clothes.
47. How will additional clothing be secured: purchase, manufacture, and/or gift?
See above.
48. How do group members get food: own production, purchasing in market, gift etc.?
(1 - more) Market, (2- less) food aid.
49. Do all the group members have enough food? If not, who is most affected by the lack of food?
Not enough. Everyone.
50. How does the group get fuel for cooking and other uses?
Buy or collect.
51. Have group members lost any household resources (utensils, soap for personal hygiene, bedding, tools etc.) due to the disaster?
Yes. Some almost all possessions.
52. How will these be replaced: sale of assets, gift, purchase, etc?
Share what they have. No money to buy more.
53. Do people in the group have any concerns about personal safety, either in the group or when outside the group? If yes, who is affected and why?
See above. Ok in camp, but outside is a problem.
54. Is there adequate health care for the group?
Not enough. Too many people, no beds (presumably for overnight care.)
55. Is health care free, including drugs?
Yes.
56. If health care is not free, how do group members pay the costs involved?
NA
57. Does the group use latrines? If yes, indicate their type, location and ownership (family, group of families, communal).
Yes, slab/single hole.
58. Are there enough latrines?
No. Heavy use and overcrowded.
59. If no, why people do not have them?
Lack of assistance.
60. Is there any agro-chemicals use in the camp? If yes, note type, sources and for what purpose the agro-chemicals are used.
Yes.
61. Have agro-chemical users received training on safe use?
Hopefully.
62. Is the group aware of the dangers of excessive application of agro-chemicals?
Not clear.

E. Conclusion

63. How would the group describe a good future for the group?
Safe conditions, schools, development.

64. What suggestions do group members make as to how environmental issues in the group should be addressed?
Housing, schools, food, clothes, plastic sheeting, sanitation, work.

F. Coping Strategies

65. If not indicated elsewhere during discussions with the group, note specific coping strategies which are being used.

See above.

G. Observations

66. Is the area near the group meeting clean of human/animal waste and garbage?
No, but some areas of the camp were much cleaner than others.
67. Are waste sites (where people throw waste or use as a toilet) distant from the camp?
Yes and no. Depends on which IO/NGO is providing assistance.
68. Are there obvious insect breeding sites (particularly for flies and mosquitoes) in the camp?
Yes. Latrines and waste water. But chlorine spaying is taking place and it appears that pesticide spraying is planned.
69. Is the camp graveyard distant from housing and water supplies?
Yes.
70. If there is a health facility in the camp are medical wastes disposed of safely? (yes/no)
Could not be verified. One clinic visited did not have operating latrines.

IDP Camp REA Information

A. General Information

1. Date: September 27, 2004
2. Time Started: 1355
3. Time End: 1522
4. Name of Camp and Group: Bajoum, near Taishia. In SLA area.
5. Group composition: Initially 10 men/4 women. Group grew considerably during session
6. Distance of camp from main road and state capital: 48 km
7. Person/s conducting the assessment: Kelly, various.
8. Nature of access to the camp: track
9. Ethnic group/s and religion diversity present in the camp: Dadjo, Zawawa, Fir, Bertie, Denka, Bagirma.
10. Description of the camp. Dispursed camp along main road. Has small market. May be near village. Not high density. Considerable open land near camp. Water source in wadi 4 km away. In an area with gum Arabic trees. Was considered valuable land previously, so no settlement. With lower value of gum Arabic, "sheik" has allows people to settle in the area.
11. Description of the origin of the camp. Camp into existence o/a June 04, has grown since as people have come from attacked villages. Some people have come to camp, gone back to village and then returned.
12. Number of people currently in the camp: 500 families (2,000 people?)

B. Environment and Livelihood Information

Environment

13. How does the group describe the environment in which the camp is located?
Not as good as "home". Suitable for now. The situation is better than in Kalma.
14. Is the camp near any unique environmental areas (e.g., national park, industrial site)?
Gum Arabic. People couldn't use area previously, now can use the area since gum Arabic has lower value.
15. Are there any areas which the group considers as special, such as holy sites, locations of natural resources or places which are protected by tradition? (Where possible, identify exact location.)
None reported.
16. Does the group have any specific concerns about the environment?
No, but water is 4 km away.
17. Does the group see the location of the camp as one that is safe from floods, erosion, and other problems?
Yes.
18. What are the rules that the group has governing the use of natural resources (agriculture land, forests, pasture, water)? Is there any difference for males and females?
No specific information.
19. How does the group resolve a dispute over the use of natural resources (forest, pasture or land use) water or other natural resources?

Local legal system.

20. Have group members faced any problems with neighboring communities in terms of collecting wood, water or food?

No.

Livelihood/ economic activities

21. Nature of livelihood system before coming to the camp:

(1) Farming, (2) Animals, (3) trading grain, (4) trade.

22. What are major current ways of getting income and who among family members are involved?

Describe major occupation in terms of importance.

Cut trees (men and women), make charcoal (men), make mats (women). Sell animals for big purchases; sell wood/mats for daily needs (e.g., food).

23. What is the wealth diversity in the group?

Equal. People sharing water (e.g., sharing water if people don't have animals to collect water), sharing milk from animals with those who don't have access.

24. Are families supported by only one type of work, or by several family members with different occupations?

All family. Most common tasks are selling wood and charcoal. There is a market in the camp. Wood and charcoal is moved to Nyala via small and large trucks and donkey cards.

C. Disaster Information

25. Has the group been affected by any of the following events in the past year?

Drought, birds, animal disease and conflict. During drought, people make and sell maps.

Discussions focused on the conflict.

26. What was the cause and impact of the disaster?

Attacks on villages.

27. What damage happened as a result? Describe human and material damages.

People lost all or most of their possessions through theft and fire. Some deaths and injuries reported.

28. How many people have left the community due to the disaster, where did they go and when are they expected back?

All left. Some people left, came back to village and then returned to camp.

29. When did the disaster start and how long is it expected to continue?

June 04, or earlier.

30. Has the type of work that people do to support families changed since the start of the disaster?

Yes, now mostly wood collection, charcoal making and mat making.

31. What has the group done to address the disaster? What coping mechanisms have been used?

32. Since the disaster began, how do people in the group get money and have these sources changed? (List sources and changes.)

See #30 above. Also borrow from neighbors or from people in Nyala.

33. Has the group been able to address (1) most, (2) some, (3) few of the impacts of the disaster from their own resources?

Few, and with difficulty.

34. Has the group received any assistance from the government or NGOs to deal with the disaster?

Yes.

35. What kind of assistance was received? (List, including origin – government, donor, NGO, other communities, people who have left the group-- if possible)

GOS – NO

NGO (NCA and others?) – Plastic, jerry cans, soap, blankets, cooking sets, clothes.

36. Was this assistance considered to be (1) a lot of assistance, (2) enough assistance, (3) just some assistance, (3) little assistance?

75% of what is needed.

37. Has this assistance (1) improved, (2) stabilized or (3) not had much impact on conditions in the group?

Improved. Plastic has improved shelter and some diseases have disappeared.

38. Has the assistance which has been provided caused any problems for the group? (Prompt for impact on the environment.)

Yes. Not enough assistance. People have not gotten assistance because they have not been in the camp when assistance was distributed.

39. When the disaster is over, how long does the group think it will for things to return to normal?

Will want to stay where the camp is located. What is in the past is in the villages they came from.

40. What is necessary for the group to return to their communities?

Water, schools, well.

D. Basic Needs

41. How does the group get water: purchase, wells, cisterns, lakes, ponds etc.? Indicate more than one if needed)

Hand pump at 4 km.

42. How does the group describe the water quality?

Salty.

43. Is there enough water for everyone in the group?

No.

44. What types of shelter does the group use?

Grass, plastic, sticks. 75% have plastic.

45. How did group members get materials to build a shelter?

From surrounding area.

46. How does the group meet their needs for clothing?

Some have/some don't. Not enough.

47. How will additional clothing be secured: purchase, manufacture, and/or gift?

Not clear. Sell wood, charcoal, grass.

48. How do group members get food: own production, purchasing in market, gift etc.? (Indicate importance if more than one source.)

Buy. No WFP food.

49. Do all the group members have enough food? If not, who is most affected by the lack of food?

No.

50. How does the group get fuel for cooking and other uses?

Collect from surrounding areas. Daily to 3 times a week. Depends if person has a donkey.

51. Have group members lost any household resources?

Yes, some to all.

52. How will these be replaced: sale of assets, gift, purchase, etc?

Purchase or aid.

53. Do people in the group have any concerns about personal safety, either in the group or when outside the group? If yes, who is affected and why?

Ok in camp. Concerned by fighting near camp.

54. Is there adequate health care for the group?

No.

55. Is health care free, including drugs?

Not available.

56. If health care is not free, how do group members pay the costs involved?

NA

57. Does the group use latrines? If yes, indicate their type, location and ownership (family, group of families, communal).

No.

58. Are there enough latrines?

No. Only one in camp.

59. If no, why people do not have them?

Only one.

60. Is there any agro-chemicals use in the camp? If yes, note type, sources and for what purpose the agro-chemicals are used.

No.

61. Have agro-chemical users received training on safe use?

NA

62. Is the group aware of the dangers of excessive application of agro-chemicals?

NA.

E. Conclusion

63. How would the group describe a good future for the group?

Camp will become a village with health care and education. It will be a nice place to have a village.

64. What suggestions do group members make as to how environmental issues in the group should be addressed?

Survey and plan out the camp so that it can become a village.

F. Coping Strategies

65. If not indicated elsewhere during discussions with the group, note specific coping strategies which are being used in response to the disaster.

In addition to above, wage labor (in Nyala), using donkeys for hire.

G. Observations

66. Is the area near the group meeting clean of human/animal waste and garbage?

No, but there isn't much garbage.

67. Are waste sites (where people throw waste or use as a toilet) distant from the camp?

No.

68. Are there obvious insect breeding sites (particularly for flies and mosquitoes) in the camp?

Yes. Animal dung.

69. Is the camp graveyard distant from housing and water supplies?

Not discussed.

70. If there is a health facility in the camp are medical wastes disposed of safely? (yes/no)

No facility.

From: C. Kelly
To: CARE International Sudan
Subject: Darfur REA – Khartoum Level Assessment

16/ix/04

This memo presents the results of the Darfur REA process conducted in Khartoum. This is one of three planned assessment tasks, the other two being a field level organizational assessment in Nyala and community level assessments in camps in South Darfur. The Khartoum-level assessment focused on IDPs in camps in the three Darfurs, not the total IDP population.

The Khartoum level assessment “team” was composed of myself (as facilitator) and two Sudanese nationals, one from a NGO involved in development and relief activities in Darfur and the other a member of an Sudanese environmental NGO with considerable experience in environmental impact assessment and familiar with parts of Darfur. Both Sudanese have visited Darfur since the beginning of the crisis and know the area from before the crisis. Participation from other NGOs and IOs based in Khartoum was invited but did not materialize.

The assessment generally followed the process outlined in the Guidelines. The critical issues, i.e., those having an immediate affect on life, are identified below, with a summary recommended actions to address each issue.

These results should not be seen as fully representative assessment, but provide an initial “snap-shot” of critical disaster-environment linkages in Darfur from a non-IO/INGO Khartoum perspective. The information collected during the assessment session is provided on the following pages.

Darfur Khartoum Rating Form – Critical Issues (page 10) provides a list of the critical issues identified in the assessment, including 23 issues impacting welfare or the environment. Several of these issues relate to conditions before the crisis or which should be addressed through medium to long term interventions.

Issue	Response
Water (as unmet need)	Provide water.
Availability of natural resources	Provide security, provide alternative sources of natural resources (related to cooking and fuel wood collection)
Capacity to absorb waste	Build more latrines, increase awareness of proper sanitation, advocacy for good sanitation, provide systems for the safe disposal of human waste in latrines.
Armed conflict	Peace
Disease	Increase health care delivery.
Food	Increase food supply. Provide milled food
Water Supply – Reduce opportunities for disease transmission	Improve management of water sites.
Sanitation – all aspects related to the provision of relief.	Improve sanitation.
Health Care – Disposal of medical waste.	Establish system for safe waste disposal.
Relief Supplies – All environmental issues identified in the assessment form.	Provide assistance which meets food and other needs of the population.

Context Statement

The immediate cause of the Darfur crisis is fighting between ethnically-defined groups. At one level, this fighting has its origins in past conflicts over access to natural resources, including land and water. The current conflict is more directly tied to the GOS response to attacks by dissident groups in Darfur. The initial attacks were intended to draw attention to local concerns that the allocation of power and resources within Sudan has not been equitable. The immediate result of the fighting has been:

- The displacement of over 1.5 million individuals (at least 1.3 million IDPs and .3 million refugees),
- The destruction of community and household assets in the communities attacked by GOS-aligned forces, and
- Considerable insecurity.

The large area affected, the dispersed and only partially accessible affected populations and poor infrastructure all are making the delivery of relief assistance extremely difficult.

The rainy season is ending which should lead to improved ground access to displaced populations. As the dry season progresses, surface water sources will become more scarce and demand for water can be expected to increase. The area affected covers several agro-climatologic zones, with corresponding differences in weather patterns and livelihoods systems.

Current assistance priorities focus on the provision of the basic needs of water, food, shelter, basic sanitation, health care and protection. These needs are being met at levels estimated to be between approximately 60 and 18 per cent. Efforts are also underway to identify an appropriate stove for use in IDP camps to reduce the need for fuel. Although the origins of the conflict relate to fiscal and physical resource allocations and there are several current environmental issues (e.g., the needs for stoves, camp location and lay-out, destruction of productive assets) there is no focal point for environmental issue in the emergency coordinating structure. Planning on medium term environmental impacts (e.g., from drilling wells) has apparently not occurred.

What sources are likely to be able to provide information on the environment in the area affected by the disaster? See:

- Sustainable Development in Sudan: Ten Years After Rio Summit, H. A. A, Ati, Environmentalist Society, Khartoum and Heinrich Boll Foundation, Nairobi, 2002, and
- Environmental Threats and Opportunities Assessment, T. Catterson, USAID/REDSO/NPC and USAID/Sudan Task Force, Washington, 2003.

Have there been, or are there currently, concerns about the release of potentially toxic substances affecting humans or the environment?

None.

Are there environmentally unique sites in the disaster area and have any been (or may be) affected directly or indirectly by the disaster?

Archeological site near Nyala. Jebel Maria Mountains. Wetlands at Um Dafork.

Are there any concerns about the environmental impact of the disaster on the part of the survivors or neighboring communities?

Drought, desertification, competition for natural resources (factors also preceding the crisis).

Are there any local or national laws, or donor or organizational policies and procedures which impact how environmental issues will be assessed or managed?

The Sudan Environmental Act of 2001 provides for environmental impact assessments but does not apply in this situation.

Rating Form 1: Factors Influencing Environmental Impacts - Bolded Ratings Indicate High Priority

Factor	Rating	Implication
Number of persons affected (relative to total population in disaster area).	Some	The greater number affected the greater potential impact on the environment.
Duration: Time since onset of disaster.	Months to years	The longer the disaster the greater the potential impact on the environment.
Concentration of the affected population.	Moderate	The more concentrated (or dense) the living conditions of the survivors, the greater potential impact.
Distance disaster survivors have moved since the beginning of the disaster.	Far from point of origin	The further survivors have to move, the greater the potential impact on the environment.
Self-Sufficiency: After the start of the disaster, the ability of survivors to meet needs without recourse to additional direct extraction from the environment or external assistance.	Low	Low self-sufficiency after the disaster implies greater risk of damage to the environment.
Social solidarity: Solidarity between disaster survivors and non-affected populations.	Not strong or weak.	Weak solidarity may indicate the likelihood of conflict over resources and limits to the ability of survivors to meet needs.
Cultural homogeneity: The similarity of cultural beliefs and practices between disaster survivors and non-affected populations.	High	A lack of common cultural structure may result in disagreement over resource use.
Asset distribution: The distribution of economic and other assets within disaster affected population after the start of the disaster.	Equitable	Concentration of assets with one part of a population can lead to tensions with less-well endowed groups over use of environmental assets.
Livelihood options: The number of options that disaster survivors have to assure their livelihoods after the start of the disaster.	Few	The fewer the number of livelihood options indicates the disaster survivors may pose higher pressure upon fewer resources of the environment.
Expectations: The level of assistance (local and external) which the disaster survivors expect to need to survive.	High	In the absence of adequate assistance, high expectations can lead to high demand on local resources.
Availability of natural resources , or whether the available natural resources meet the needs of the disaster survivors in a way which can continue without degradation to the environment or future availability of the resources.	Low	Excessive use of natural resources leads to environment damage. Relief can be used to reduce excessive resource demand or repair damage done to the environment. The resources in question are water (for human consumption and for other uses), forest resources (timber, firewood), agriculture land (soil and water quality), et cetera.

Factor	Rating	Implication
Capacity to absorb waste: The environmental, social and physical structures available to handle waste produced by the survivors.	Low	Low waste absorptive capacity will lead to environmental damage.
Environmental Resilience: Ability of eco-system to rebound from the disaster itself and from relief and recovery activities which cause environmental damage.	Low	Low resilience likely means high fragility and greater possibility of long-term environmental damage.

Rating Form 2: Environmental Threats of Disasters - Inappropriate hazards have been eliminated.

Hazard	Guidance as to whether the hazard presents a significant threat.	Is the physical area affected: Large (first priority), Medium (second priority) or, Small (third priority)?	Initial Response Options
Wild Fire: Loss of Habitat. Wildfire damages or destroys habitat resulting in negative impact on species using habitat before fire.	Lack of alternative habitats for species under threat.	Small	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institute activities to restore or modify damaged habitat. 2. Make alternate habitats available to species under threat.
Drought: Drying of Crops. Lack of water (from rainfall or irrigations) for normal crop development.	Insufficient water for normal crop grown. Note that impact can due to a lack in total amount of water available, or periods of a lack or insufficient of water at critical crop development stages.	Large	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As above. 2. Implement water conservation methods, e.g., mulching. 3. Consider temporary reallocation of available water supplies to ensure proper crop development (for irrigation-dependent crops). 4. Identify alternate used for crops which do not mature properly, e.g., as livestock feed.
Disease. Human Mortality and morbidity reducing social and economic activity and increasing personal hardship.	Disease incidence significantly above normal. Note that specific criteria and methods exist to determine if an epidemic is occurring or a threat, and should be used to	Medium (based on WHO report of increased mortality in North and West Darfur)	Disease control-related measures focusing on environmental factors such as water supply and quality, sanitation, pollution reduction and living condition (e. g., other hazards like flooding or crowded conditions). Many responses are likely to be common sense and relate to other threats to disaster survivors.

Hazard	Guidance as to whether the hazard presents a significant threat.	Is the physical area affected: Large (first priority), Medium (second priority) or, Small (third priority)?	Initial Response Options
	assess threat significance.		
<p>Armed Conflict (between and within countries): Active fighting by military units (“conventional warfare”). Intentional damage to infrastructure, including power, water, sewage and industrial capacity due to active fighting. Limitations on ability to deliver basic supplies to non-combatant populations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active military efforts to cause damage. 2. Inability or reduced ability to deliver minimum supplies of water, food, sanitation services and basic care due to fighting or infrastructure damage 	Large	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of protected systems for delivery of minimum supplies of critical items (water, food, sanitation services, health care). 2. Use of neutral parties to deliver supplies and manage efforts to address damage caused by fighting. 3. Debris should be recycled or disposed in a way to minimize air, water and land pollution.

Rating Form 3: Unmet Basic Needs

Basic Needs	At what level were needs being met before the disaster?	Are needs being met at present?	Will the quality or quantity of the resources used to meet this need be reduced significantly in the next 120 days? (Yes/no)	Indicators (Based on Sphere indicators. The closer the indicators are met in full, the higher the score. These indicators are guides. Use depends on available data and familiarity of users with Sphere Standards.)
	Answer the question above with one of the following responses: * Not met at all. * Only partially met. * Largely met. * Totally met.			
Water	Partially	Partially	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15 liters of water per person per day. Waiting time at point of delivery not more than 15 minutes. Distance from shelter to water point no more than 500 meters. Water is palatable and of sufficient quality to be used without significant risk to health due to water-borne diseases, or chemical or radiological contamination during short-term use. (Note: contaminates includes human and industrial waste and agro-chemicals.)
Food	Largely met	Largely met	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum food needs met : On average, 2,100 kilo-calories per person per day, 10-12% of total energy from protein, 17% of total energy from fat, and adequate micro-nutrient intake. Food supplies are accessible at affordable prices and supply and costs are stable over time. Food distribution is equitable, transparent, safe and covers basic needs (together with other food items available).
Shelter	Totally met	Partially met	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3.5 square meters of covered space per person providing protection from weather and fresh air, security and privacy. <u>In hot climates</u>, shelter materials, construction and ventilation adequate to keep in-shelter temperature 10 degrees centigrade below outside temperature. <u>In cold climates</u>, shelter material, construction, and heating ensure internal temperature no less than 15 degrees centigrade Camps, temporary shelter sites or resettlement sites are safe and have adequate access to basic services. . 45 square meters space is available per person in temporary camps or shelters, with provision made for living, social and commercial activities.
Personal	Totally met	Totally met	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Disaster survivors have sufficient personal liberty and security at all times.

Basic Needs	At what level were needs being met before the disaster?	Are needs being met at present?	Will the quality or quantity of the resources used to meet this need be reduced significantly in the next 120 days? (Yes/no)	<p style="text-align: center;">Indicators</p> (Based on Sphere indicators. The closer the indicators are met in full, the higher the score. These indicators are guides. Use depends on available data and familiarity of users with Sphere Standards.)
	Answer the question above with one of the following responses: * <i>Not met at all.</i> * <i>Only partially met.</i> * <i>Largely met.</i> * <i>Totally met.</i>			
Safety				2. Opportunities for violence are minimized to the extent possible. Opportunities for violence should be noted and linked to specific environmental issues when appropriate.
Health Care	Partially met	Totally met	No	1. Disaster survivors have adequate, timely and affordable access to care for injuries and health (including psychosocial) problems arising from the disaster. 2. Health management interventions are appropriate for chronic and acute health risks faced by disaster survivors and take into account age and gender. (See Sphere Standards for specifics.)
Waste management (liquid and solid)	Largely met	Partially met	No	1. Toilets are clean and safe, with a maximum of 20 people per toilet and are no more than 50 meters from dwellings 2. Use of toilets is arranged by household(s) and/or segregated by sex. 3. Environment is acceptably free of solid waste contamination, including medical wastes. 4. Refuse containers are easily available and refuse is disposed of in a way to avoid creating health and environmental problems 5. No contaminated or dangerous medical wastes in living or public space.
Environmental Conditions	Largely met	Partially met	Yes	1. Location of disaster survivors is not subject to immediate hazards, including flooding, pollution, landslides, fire, or volcanic eruptions, or effective mitigation measures have been taken. 2. Environment is free from risk of water erosion, from standing water and a slope of no more than 6%. 3. Smoke and fumes are below nuisance levels and pose no threat to human health. 4. Animal management minimizes opportunities for disease transmission, solid and liquid waste problems and environmental degradation. 5. Uncontrolled extraction of natural resources by disaster survivors is not taking place.

Basic Needs	At what level were needs being met before the disaster?	Are needs being met at present?	Will the quality or quantity of the resources used to meet this need be reduced significantly in the next 120 days? (Yes/no)	Indicators (Based on Sphere indicators. The closer the indicators are met in full, the higher the score. These indicators are guides. Use depends on available data and familiarity of users with Sphere Standards.)
	Answer the question above with one of the following responses: * <i>Not met at all.</i> * <i>Only partially met.</i> * <i>Largely met.</i> * <i>Totally met.</i>			
				6. Graveyard (s) is appropriately located and sized.
Fuel	Largely met	Not met	Yes	1. Fuel availability meets immediate needs. 2. Low smoke and fuel-efficient wood stoves, gas or kerosene stoves and cooking pots with well-fitting lids are available.
Lighting	Largely met	Not met	Yes	Sufficient to meet security requirements and for normal economic and social activities.
Domestic Resources	Largely met	Partially met	Yes	Each household unit has access to adequate utensils, soap for personal hygiene and necessary tools. (Specific minimum needs identified in Sphere Handbook Chapter 4, Section 2).
Clothing	Largely met	Partially met	Yes	Clothing is appropriate for climatic conditions, gender, age, safety, dignity, and well-being.
Transport	Largely met	Not met	Yes	1. Adequate to deliver goods and services to displaced at reasonable cost and convenience. 2. Adequate to permit disaster survivors to reach goods and services at reasonable cost and convenience.

Rating Form 4: Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities

Notes: Local coping strategies were not included in this part of the assessment due to a lack of information. Only those interventions known to be underway were considered.

Intervention	Questions on whether potential negative environmental consequences of proposed interventions have been addressed.	Yes/No answer to the question immediately to the left.	Selected Avoidance or Mitigation Options
Harvesting wild plants/fruits	Are steps taken to avoid harvesting rates which exceed production capacity or reduces future production capacity?	No	Establish harvest system based on a balance between rates of extraction and regeneration.
Construction, including shelter, public buildings and infrastructure excluding roads.	1. Are plans and procedures established to prevent scarce natural resources from being over exploited for construction activities?	No	1. Develop and follow resource management and land use management plans. 2. Assess hazards in area where construction will take place and change siting or methods accordingly. 3. Ensure construction methods reflect known hazards and risks and are used to reduce vulnerability.
	2. Are plans and procedures established to ensure that the construction site is not in an area of increased hazard compared to location or conditions before disaster?	Yes	
	3. Are plans and procedures in place to avoid increases risk of flooding, erosion or other hazards due to the construction?	Yes	
	4. Do construction methods and procedures take into account the risk of disaster?	Not known.	
Water Supply	1. Are increased opportunities for disease transmission avoided?	Unclear	1. Establish and maintain water treatment system. 2. Design and maintain water supply structure to minimize standing water and vector breeding sites. 3. Plan water provision based on anticipated need and use plan for delivery area which allows current and future needs to be met. 4. Establish water resource use plan and monitor use and supply. 5. Consider economic incentives to conserve water. 6. Use hazardous chemicals as recommended and limit inappropriate use through education.
	2. Are there plans and procedures to avoid an increase in population density having a negative environmental impact?	No	
	3. Is the overuse of ground or surface water supplies avoided?	Yes	
	4. Are chemicals used to clean or purify water managed in such a way to avoid human health dangers or contamination of the environment?	Not known	

Intervention	Questions on whether potential negative environmental consequences of proposed interventions have been addressed.	Yes/No answer to the question immediately to the left.	Selected Avoidance or Mitigation Options
Sanitation, including latrines, waste treatment and transport infrastructure, and solid waste management.	1. Is the creation of hazardous waste sites avoided?	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish and maintain sites for sanitary and safe waste disposal operating at international standards. 2. Limit waste movement through appropriate collection systems meeting accepted best practices. 3. Minimize opportunities for disease transmission and vectors. 4. Establish and maintain environmental monitoring program covering air, land and water pollution.
	2. Is additional pollution of land, water and air avoided?	No	
	3. Is an increase in disease transmission and presence of disease vectors avoided?	No	
Health Care	1. Is pollution from disposal of medical and other waste avoided?	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish system for safe disposal of all wastes (solid and liquid). 2. Develop a resource management plan for harvesting of local medicinal herbs and plants.
	2. Is an increased demand for traditional medical herbs and plants which exceeds sustainable yield avoided?	?	
Relief Supplies	1. Are steps taken to ensure that relief packaging does not create a solid waste disposal problem?	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use biodegradable, multi-use or recyclable packaging where possible. 2. Collect packaging as part of distribution program. 3. Develop program of education and facilities for safe disposal of personal hygiene materials. 4. Base assistance on needs assessment including survivor input. 5. Don't provide inappropriate materials. 6. Select assistance based on local social and economic conditions and sustainability of supply.
	2. Are steps taken to ensure that personal hygiene materials are disposed of properly and pose no health and sanitation problem?	No	
	3. Are steps taken to ensure that relief assistance is appropriate or acceptable to survivors and not discarded?	No	
	4. Are there procedures to ensure that relief does not create new and unsustainable consumption habits on part of survivors?	No	
Training	Are steps taken to ensure that new skills learned do not lead to greater extraction of resources or production of waste?	No	Include environmental education and waste management options in training programs.

Darfur Khartoum Rating Form – Critical Issues

Issue	Importance (Affecting Life, Welfare or the Environment)	Actions for Issues Affecting Life.
Context		
Competition for Resources	E	
Drought	E	
Implementation of Environmental Laws	E	
Desertification	E	
Lack of development	W	
More rational use of resources	W	
Provision of water	L	Provide water
Factors		
Duration	W	
Distance	W	
Self-sufficiency	W	
Livelihood options	W	
Expectations	W	
Availability of Natural resources (related to securing fuel)	L	Provide security, provide alternative sources of natural resources (energy)
Capacity to absorb waste	L	Build more latrines, awareness/advocacy, safe disposal systems.
Environmental Resilience	W	
Threats		
Drought	E	
Armed conflict	L	Peace
Disease	L	Increase health care delivery
Unmet Needs		
Fuel (use not sustainable)	W	
Lighting (use not sustainable)	W	
Transport (use not sustainable) (Note: Donkeys key form of transport, but many died during or after movement to camps.	W	
Food	L	Increase food supply. Milled food
Environmental Conditions	W	
Domestic resources	W	
Clothing	W	
Negative Relief		
Harvesting wild food	E	
Construction – procuring scarce natural resources	E	
Water Supply – reduce disease transmission	L	Increase water supply
Water Supply – avoid increase in population around water supply points	E	Provide sanitation and health education.
Sanitation – all	L	Improve sanitation
Health Care – pollution/disposal	L	Safe disposal of medical waste.
Relief Supplies – no to all	L	Provide appropriate to people and meeting food habits.
Training	W	