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This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) commissioned by UNHCR and WFP regarding assistance to Bhutanese Refugees in Nepal. The JAM took place from 29 May-9 June 2006. The Mission included representatives from UNHCR and WFP offices in Nepal and Thailand. In addition, an official from the European Commission Office for Humanitarian Assistance (ECHO) joined the team for three days as an observer. The focus of the 2006 JAM was on developing strategies that would lead to durable solutions and overall management improvements in the operation. For detailed terms of reference see Annex I.

The Mission acknowledges the commendable progress made towards the implementation of the 2004 JAM recommendations with the exception of those related to durable solutions and census. The major findings and recommendations of the Mission are presented in the Executive Summary below. The JAM Report on Operational Issues elaborates on the findings.

Executive Summary

Overview

The Bhutanese refugees, mostly ethnic Nepalese from southern Bhutan, first entered Nepal at the end of 1990. UNHCR began providing ad-hoc assistance to Bhutanese asylum-seekers in February 1991. By September 1991, there were approximately 5,000 refugees when His Majesty’s Government of Nepal (HMG-N) formally requested UNHCR to co-ordinate all emergency assistance for the Bhutanese refugees. Thus, UNHCR, the WFP and several Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) launched a major program in the early part of 1992. Since its initiation, UNHCR has provided protection to these refugees in seven camps in Jhapa and Morang in coordination with government authorities. In the camps, WFP, UNHCR and partners are providing food, water, shelter, health, education, protection and other non-food items. The established health and nutrition indicators suggest that the assistance has been adequate and, in fact, exceeds the national standards for Nepali citizens.

The positive and open attitude of the Government of Nepal (GoN) is commendable. However, the relationship with some groups in host communities seems to be becoming strained, in particular with the Community Forest-Users Groups (CFUG) who are objecting to refugees using the available forest resources. The Bhutanese refugees themselves are very well organized individually and collectively. However, with recent decreases in material assistance and the lack of a durable solution, tension and frustration are clearly evident among the refugee population. While the GoN is placing the refugee issue as a policy priority, bilateral talks between the two governments had yet to be resumed at the time this report was drafted in June 2006.

In the open discussions with the Mission, Camp Management Committee (CMC) members, as well as members of the refugee communities, refugees did not exclude the option of resettlement to a third country, and some even indicated their wish to be resettled.
Over the years the refugees have enjoyed an extremely high level of support and thus reductions or changes often are regarded as a punishment. To cite several examples, the targeted distribution of shelter and latrine repair materials to vulnerable households was introduced in 2005. Kerosene distribution was suspended at the end of 2005 and replaced by briquettes but this move had a big impact on the refugees since many used the fuel as a substitute for cash. The refugee reaction to this was quite strong and even impacted security in the camps.

In addition, the amount of vegetables provided has been gradually reduced from 700 grams per person per week in 2003 to 260 grams in 2006. Further to the 2004 JAM recommendation, the food basket for general rations was revised to meet 2,100 kcal in itself and to provide necessary micro-nutrients by inclusion of fortified blended food (WSB). While fresh vegetables are intended to provide diversity and palatability of food and not to augment vitamins and minerals, it is a tangible reduction in the eyes of refugees. The provision of bathing soap to the refugees also was discontinued as of January 2006. UNHCR’s funding constraints led to shifting of health care from a curative to a preventive approach and the application of more strict policies for approval of medical referrals, which is perceived as “another reduction” by refugees.

As noted, the refugees state that these trends in the assistance level are a sort of punishment. According to them, when these reductions started more people were compelled to search for work outside the camps.

While the change in Government in April 2006 resulted in a ceasefire which appears to still be holding at the time of this writing, the security situation in and around the camps remains tense. The refugees appear to have become emboldened by the recent political developments in Nepal and there is a sense that these actions are likely to increase. Additionally, the stalemate situation has also led to a number of psycho-social problems in the camps, with alcoholism and domestic violence being two problems of serious concern. With the frustration levels escalating among the Bhutanese, particularly the idle youth, and the current and potential future constraints, the operation is facing many challenges.

**Major Findings and Recommendations**

Against the general background described above, the following findings and recommendations of the Mission are presented in the Executive Summary:

1. **Security**

   1.1. The withdrawal of police from all the camps following a Maoist attack on a police post in the Khudunabari camp in September 2003 has made enforcing law and order in the camps and maintaining the civilian character of the camps problematic. While a unified command post was established in the vicinity of the three Beldangi camps in 2004, the lack of police presence has compelled refugees themselves to undertake tasks that were normally performed by the state security forces. To fill the gap, the capacity and skills of the Community Watch Teams (CWTs) has been enhanced. Lack of lighting at night, due to transition from kerosene to briquettes as cooking fuel, has further complicated the safety and security environment in the camps. With the new government in place there is a plan for the police to resume patrolling in some of the camps where they have been absent for more than two years.
1.2. The general insecurity and influence of the conflict in Nepal in the operational area have affected humanitarian access. However, UNHCR and WFP have managed to undertake regular activities in the camps. Access to the camps and delivery of material assistance was still possible during the general strike imposed in April 2006, but with great difficulties.

**Recommendations**

a. Safety and security to be re-established by the GoN (through the reestablishment of a police presence in the camps?) in all camps at the earliest possible time to enforce law and order and to maintain the civilian and humanitarian nature of the camps. A positive response to this issue was given by the Government to the Mission at the time of the debriefing on 8 June.

b. UNHCR to address the concerns of the youth with an integrated approach including security, confidence-building, psycho-social development, vocational and skills training, and durable solutions. Reinforce dialogue with refugee youth. Organize activities targeting youth capitalizing on the Youth Friendly Centers to be opened by UNHCR in mid-2006 (such as skills training, recreational programmes, and advocacy activities) and establish a “youth focal point” in the CMC structure.

c. UNHCR to address the security concern brought about by the lack of lighting of public space in the camps through a solar light project, subject to funding availability.

2. Census

2.1. A census to obtain accurate and updated information about the refugees living in Nepal has been requested of the Government for several years. Most of the information gathered in 1992-1993 at the time of arrival has not been checked or updated in spite of the fact that there have been many important developments during these years. Certainly the profile of this population has changed during this time. Although births, deaths, transfers-in, and transfers-out have been recorded by the Government, the data has not been systematically checked. The knowledge of the Government, UNHCR and WFP of refugee numbers and profiles are clearly insufficient to allow the agencies to provide proper assistance, to understand the refugees’ vulnerabilities and capacities, to provide protection and to seek durable solutions. Without such information, UNHCR and WFP have difficulty optimizing planning, implementing and monitoring assistance, especially within a context of shrinking resources. Moreover, some donors have raised doubts about the credibility of beneficiary figures of those receiving assistance for which UNHCR, WFP, and GoN are being held accountable.

2.2. The initial response from the Government conveyed to the Mission at the time of the debriefing on 8 June 2006 suggested that the matter is being discussed among different ministries, while the Ministry of Home Affairs does not see particular difficulties in undertaking such a census.

**Recommendations**

a. UNHCR, WFP, and donors collaboratively to advocate to the GoN the importance of having accurate and updated information about the refugees living in Nepal, both for protection and for planning and implementation of the assistance programme.
b. UNHCR to be allowed by the GoN to undertake a “census” at the earliest, prior to implementation of the next PRRO phase 2007-2008. Credibility of beneficiary figures is at stake, which may result in further reduction or suspension of financial support from donors if they are not convinced that the data are accurate.

3. Eligible Beneficiary Figure

3.1. While all refugees, irrespective of living inside or outside the camps, have the right to access international protection, the estimate of the exact number of beneficiaries present in the camps remains a concern of the Mission. The approval of the census exercise has been long overdue. At the time of the mission, a total number of 106,197 refugees were registered in the camps, though the food distribution figure in May 2006 was 104,252. The difference of 1,945 accounts for the people who have announced their departure to the government and had their food rations temporarily suspended during their absence.

3.2. The Mission expressed their concern regarding the accurate number of refugees receiving material assistance. The Mission suspects that an estimated 30% of the refugees are staying out of the camps either temporarily or permanently or leaving the camps for the day to work. This estimate is based on thorough and intensive interviews with refugees, implementing partners (IPs), the Refugee Coordination Unit (RCU) and visits to distribution sites and the huts. The Mission recommends that those who have left the camps on a permanent basis should not be included as beneficiaries of material assistance. This will positively contribute to accountability and transparency with donors.

Recommendations

a. If the census is not forthcoming by end of 2006 then other alternatives for finding accurate data on beneficiaries for material assistance should be explored. One of the measures can be by the issuance of ration cards to the heads of families and extensive monitoring by the agencies at food distribution sites.

4. Health and Nutrition

4.1. The established health and nutrition indicators suggest that the health and nutrition status of Bhutanese refugees is satisfactory. The indicators show a better situation than that of the average Nepali citizen and that services available in the refugee camps exceed the national standards. The mortality indicators were much better than what one would expect even in a stable setting, demonstrating the positive impact of the health and nutrition programmes on the health of Bhutanese refugees.

4.2. The Mission noted that the 8.79% prevalence of malnutrition in the under-five population, as reported by the annual nutrition survey in 2005, is high when compared to the WHO standard of 5% for a stable population. Some deficiencies in the survey were evident. Lack of proper definitions, the sampling technique, and generalisation of the findings in a small sample were some of the areas which undermine the validity of the survey. The figure of 8.79% is also found to be quite high when compared to the 2% prevalence reported in the annual mass screening of all children below five years of age. Even though mass screening uses the Weight for Height [WFH] median and the annual survey uses the Z score to define acute malnutrition, such a big difference in the figures cannot be explained.
4.3. Association of Medical Doctors (AMDA) also reports in the survey a higher prevalence of angular stomatitis (AS), a deficiency due to an inadequate intake of vitamin B2, in the under-5 population. Given the subjectivity of using clinical signs for the identification of micronutrient deficiency diseases, this could not be substantiated by the random checks conducted in the camp by the Mission.

**Recommendation**

a. Population-based quality nutrition survey with expert guidance to be undertaken every two years including assessment of micronutrient deficiencies is tentatively planned for the end of this year.

5. **Supplementary Feeding Programme**

5.1. The Mission observed the duration of stay of malnourished children in the supplementary feeding programme to be unacceptably high. The average duration of stay as quoted by AMDA is about two hundred days. Some children were even kept for over a year. There are currently about 219 malnourished children in the supplementary feeding programme using the weight-for-height criterion.

**Recommendations**

a. AMDA to collect the profile of all the malnourished children and possible causes of malnutrition identified and addressed in the supplementary feeding programme (SFP). Children who have been found to have congenital disorders or disability should be categorized under the “disabled” category and not included in the SFP as “malnourished”.

b. Since Wheat Soya Blend (WSB) is provided in the general ration, the Mission recommends the discontinuation of SFP for 6-12 month old infants.

6. **Food Basket**

6.1. The food basket was found to be meeting the average caloric needs of 2100 per person per day and most of the essential micronutrients by providing five basic commodities, WSB and small amounts of fresh vegetables. The inclusion of WSB in the food basket has greatly enhanced the nutritional value in meeting the essential micronutrients as well as containing outbreaks of vitamin B deficiencies. Refugees, both adult and children, seem to like the WSB and the Mission was encouraged to observe the way WSB was cooked and consumed. However, concerns were raised about the quantity and quality of the fresh vegetables provided. The seasonal fresh vegetables provided on a weekly basis present a quality problem, especially for the green leafy and watery vegetables. The primary aim of providing small amounts of vegetables appears to only be to diversify the food to enhance the palatability of the existing diet rather than to address micronutrient deficiencies, especially Vitamin Bs.
The Composition of Food Basket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Quantity (g/p/d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parboiled Rice</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Gram</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSB</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Vegetables</td>
<td>260 g/p/w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Recommendations**

a. Maintain the above food basket with the inclusion of WSB for general rations to ensure that all essential nutrition requirements are met.

b. As the current food basket does not meet the needs of riboflavin & iron in particular, the Mission recommends exploring possibility of altering the specification of WSB in such a way that at least 80% of the daily requirements of essential micronutrient nutrient are met.

c. UNHCR to further explore sustainable options for the provision of fresh vegetables in consultation with the refugees. The options proposed are: 1) provide long-life vegetable like potatoes and garlic to ensure better quality (within the allocated UNHCR budget); 2) target vegetable assistance to vulnerable families only; 3) replace vegetables with a non-food item as an income transfer.

7. **Self-reliance and Targeting**

7.1. Refugees have not been accorded the right to work or access to agricultural land. While many refugees work outside the camps, mainly as casual laborers, their earnings are far less than what is needed for sustainability. Rather, their outside earning only augments their income to meet their most essential basic needs. The population remains largely dependent on humanitarian assistance. The stalemate situation faced by the refugees, without being able to get on their feet, is of psychosocial concern as well.

7.2. The main objective of the self-reliance activities within the camps is to involve young, old and middle-aged refugees by providing training and capacity-building which will be important for rebuilding their lives once durable solutions are found. These activities are designed with an awareness of the constraints in the camps as well as the limited rights accorded to the refugees.

7.3. As observed by the team, targeted food assistance can be achieved only if the office has adequate data for analysis through a socio-economic survey on food security, the earning capacities and employment opportunities and on the willingness of the government to legally allow the refugees to work.

7.4. Due to budgetary constraints faced by UNHCR, some form of targeting of assistance in non-food items, especially in shelter, has been achieved. This was possible only through dialogue with and co-operation of the refugee community. Targeting is a sensitive issue and needs to be addressed with caution and transparency as any further cuts may have implications on staff security working in the camps. However, for those who are trained and leave the better job opportunities outside, assistance provided to them in the camp could be reviewed. The ideal way is to target
commodities based on the household economic profile. But this may not be practical and feasible in identifying households who are economically self-sufficient without a thorough census.

**Recommendations**

a. UNHCR and WFP to use positive targeting to provide assistance based on physiological vulnerability among the population. The physiological vulnerable are defined as children less than five years old, pregnant and lactating women and school children.
b. UNHCR and WFP to consider reduction of assistance across the board.
c. UNHCR and WFP could explore opportunities for enhancing the variety of items to be produced by refugees in the camps.
d. UNHCR to advocate for access to land for expansion of vegetable gardens in and adjacent to the camps.

8. **Programming Options**

8.1. It is recommended that the current PRRO 10058.4 be extended from January 2007 to December 2008. The eligible beneficiary figure should be revised on the basis of January distribution figure of 2006. On January 2006, a total of 103,789 received food. On the basis of this figure and the current projected annual population growth, the planning figure for the projected period of 2007-2008 is proposed to be 108,200. However this planning figure will be revised following the census by UNHCR to be undertaken prior to extending this PRRO.

8.2. The supplementary feeding programme will target all pregnant and lactating women and malnourished children based on nutrition survey results. A planning figure for 2007-2008 for SFP is proposed to be 2600.

**Recommendations**

a. WFP to extend the current PRRO 10058.4 for a period of two years from January 2007 to December 2008.
b. The planning figure for the New PRRO starting January 2007-December 2008 to be an average of 108,200 for general food distribution and 2600 for the SFP.
c. The current food basket as recommended above to be continued in 2007-2008.
The JAM Report on Operational Issues

Methodology

1) The Mission was divided into two teams of UHHCR and WFP staff. The teams reviewed both strategic and operational issues. During the visits to the camps, the teams gathered a great deal of both primary and secondary information. Intensive interviews, focus group discussions, meetings and validation of data were the main tasks of the teams.

2) The Mission met with the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Representatives of UNHCR and WFP in Kathmandu and their heads of sub-offices in Damak; the Chief District Officers of the two districts where the refugee camps are located (Jhapa and Morang); the Refugee Coordination Unit; the District Public Health Office and Community Forest Users’ Groups (CFUG). The Mission also had meetings with representatives of several donors and staff from the implementing partners LWF, AMDA and Caritas. An ECHO representative also joined the Mission as an observer. Several meetings were held with the Refugee Camp Management Committees and household interviews were conducted in the community. The Mission visited all the camps and meetings were held inside the camps with the Distribution Committee personnel in the camp warehouses and distribution sites, and with staff of the Bhutanese Refugee Women Forum (BRWF).

3) The Mission benefited greatly from the information package that was prepared in advance by the offices of WFP and UNHCR in Kathmandu. Additional information was provided by the various respondents and officials with whom the Mission met. As the operation is a long-running one and the data collection systems are well in place, the Mission is confident about the validity of the information provided.

Background and Context

1) The Bhutanese refugees, mostly ethnic Nepalese from Southern Bhutan, first entered Nepal at the end of 1990. UNHCR began providing ad-hoc assistance to Bhutanese asylum-seekers in February 1991. By September 1991, there were approximately 5,000 refugees when His Majesty’s Government of Nepal (HMG-N) formally requested UNHCR to co-ordinate all emergency assistance for the Bhutanese refugees. Thus, UNHCR, the WFP and several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) launched a major program in the early part of 1992. Since its inception, UNHCR has been providing protection to these refugees in seven camps in Jhapa and Morang in coordination with government authorities. In the camps, WFP, UNHCR and partners are providing food, water, shelter, health, education and other non-food items. The established health and nutrition indicators suggest that the assistance is sufficient and, in fact, exceeds the national standards for Nepali citizens.

2) Nepal is neither a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention nor its 1967 Protocol. There are no applicable regional refugee instruments nor is there national legislation governing the status and treatment of refugees. Refugee regulations are governed by the Alien Act. The camp policies and directives from the GoN restrict freedom of movement of refugees and prohibit their engagement in gainful activities, such as agriculture, trading and other business. Furthermore, agriculture land for farming in the Terai Region is limited as most of it is privately owned.
3) Although not officially recognised, many refugees find some work opportunities outside the camp environment. Generally, women tend go to nearby villages for agricultural work, men and youth find work as casual construction labourers and a few families are engaged in business.

4) The goal of the current WFP and UNHCR assistance is to contribute to the basic sustenance of health and nutrition and the provision of legal and physical international protection to the registered Bhutanese refugees while pursuing durable solutions.

5) In the open discussions with the Mission, Camp Management Committee (CMC) members as well as members of the refugee communities; the refugees did not exclude the option of resettlement to a third country, and some even indicated their wish to be resettled.

6) While the April 2006 people’s movement in Nepal resulted in a ceasefire which appears to still be holding at the time of this writing, the security situation in and around the camps remains tense. The refugees appear to have become emboldened by the recent political developments in Nepal and there is a sense that these actions are likely to increase. Additionally, the stalemate situation has also led to a number of psycho-social problems in the camps, with alcoholism and domestic violence being two problems of serious concern. With the frustration levels escalating among the refugees, particularly the idle youth, and with the current and potential constraints in the future, the operation is facing many challenges.

Findings on Operational Issues

1. Security

1.1. The withdrawal of police from all the camps, following the Maoist attack on a police post in Khudunabari camp in September 2003, has made the enforcement of law and order in the camps and maintaining the civilian character of the camps problematic. While a unified command post was established in the vicinity of the three Beldangi camps in 2004, the lack of police presence has compelled refugees themselves to undertake tasks that were normally performed by the state security forces. To fill the gap, the capacity and skills of the Community Watch Teams (CWTs) have been enhanced. Lack of lighting at night due to the transition from kerosene to briquettes as cooking fuel has further complicated the safety and security environment in the camps. With the new government in place there is a plan for the police to resume patrolling in some of the camps where they had been absent for more than two years.

1.2. The general insecurity and influence of the conflict in Nepal in the operational area have affected humanitarian access. However, UNHCR and WFP have managed to undertake regular activities in the camps. Access to the camps and delivery of material assistance were still possible during the general strike imposed in April 2006, but with great difficulties.

2. Census

2.1. A census to obtain accurate and updated information about the refugees living in Nepal has been requested of the GoN for several years. Most of the information gathered in 1992-1993 at the time of arrival has not been checked or updated, in spite of the fact that there have been many developments during these years. Certainly the profile of this population has changed during this time. Although births, deaths,
transfers-in, and transfers-out have been recorded by the GoN, the data has not been systematically checked. The Government, UNHCR and WFP knowledge of refugee numbers and profiles are clearly insufficient to allow the agencies to provide proper assistance, to understand the refugees’ vulnerabilities and capacities, to provide protection and to seek durable solutions. Without such information, UNHCR and WFP can not optimize planning, implementation and monitoring of assistance, notably within a context of shrinking resources. Moreover, some donors have raised doubts about the credibility of beneficiary figures receiving assistance, a critical performance indicator for which UNHCR, WFP, and the GoN are being held accountable.

2.2. The initial response from the GoN conveyed to the Mission at the time of the debriefing on 8 June 2006 suggested that the matter is being discussed among different ministries, and the Ministry of Home Affairs does not see particular difficulties in undertaking such a census.

3. Eligible Beneficiary Figure

3.1. While all refugees, irrespective of living inside or outside the camps, have the right to access international protection, the estimation of the exact number of beneficiaries present in the camps remains a concern of the Mission. The approval of the census exercise has been long overdue. On 31 May 2006, a total number of 106,197 refugees were registered in the camps, but the food distribution figure in May 2006 was 104,252. The difference of 1,945 accounts for the absentees over a long period of time. Absenteeism from the camps is caused by the migration to third countries plus education and work outside the camps. For detailed demographic profile refer Annex VI.

3.2. The Mission expressed concern regarding the accurate number of refugees receiving material assistance. The Mission suspects that an estimated 30% of the refugees are staying out of the camps either temporarily or permanently. This estimate is based on thorough and intensive interviews with refugees, Implementing Partners, RCU and visits to distribution sites and the huts. The Mission recommends that those who have left the camps on a permanent basis should not be included as beneficiaries of the material assistance. This will positively contribute to accountability and transparency with donors.

4. Health and Nutrition

4.1. The established health and nutrition indicators suggest that the health and nutrition status of the Bhutanese refugees is satisfactory. The indicators show a better situation than that of the average Nepali citizen and that the services available in the refugee camps exceed the national standards. The mortality indicators were much better than what one would expect even in a stable setting, demonstrating the positive impact of the health and nutrition programmes on the health of Bhutanese refugees.

4.2. The infrastructure and staffing of the Primary Health Care (PHC) service during the year was the result of a reform to meet UNHCR standards and indicators. The previous configuration was a legacy from the emergency phase of operation and led to the development of a ‘two-tiered’ system of primary health care. A new model of primary health care inside the camps was developed, with clarification of the respective roles of AMDA and Bhutanese Health Association (BHA) that has been defined and agreed upon by both partners. The objective is to create one common system of health care within the camps, while further strengthening community
health promotion and education. This meant closure of the basic health units run by BHA and integrating preventive and curative services at the primary health care clinic level. This has also led to a reduction in the health staff numbers, which the Mission found to be commendable. There were no major complaints from refugees on this change.

4.3. The Integrated Management of Childhood Illness Programme was launched in all camps in 2005 in an effort to make the most effective use of human and material resources as well as reducing child mortality and morbidity. As a part of the package, and in an attempt to improve health care delivery during the night, solar panels were installed in the emergency health centers in all camps to facilitate lighting. Health workers and the community seem very appreciative of this initiative.

4.4. The first behavioral surveillance survey was conducted in the refugee camps and the surrounding host communities in 2005. The predominant objective of the survey was to assess HIV risk-related behaviour among Bhutanese refugees and to investigate whether there were any sexual links or bridges between the refugees and the host community. The report is currently in draft form and is expected to facilitate future planning in this area.

4.5. With a strategic vision, UNHCR has strengthened its ties with other UN agencies, the GoN and other health NGOs in the country to ensure better, comprehensive and sustainable health care services to the refugees. Closer networking with UNFPA was achieved in an attempt to comprehensively address the reproductive health needs of the refugees. A joint concept note for conducting mobile reproductive health camps within the refugee camps has been submitted to funding agencies. The project aims to serve directly about 14,000 refugee women, men, and adolescents living in seven refugee camps of Jhapa and Morang districts. In addition, a significant number of people from the host communities will be able to access the reproductive health services.

4.6. UNHCR’s health budget constitutes about 20% of their total programme budget. There is considerable pressure from refugees on the health staff for making referrals to hospitals. The recent overall budget constraints to some extent require a strict referral policy. In addition, the security situation in the previous months and the poor condition of referral vehicles has hampered transport of elective patients to secondary and tertiary referral institutions. With the budget reduction for referrals in 2006, the Mission’s impression is that the referral services provided must be to only the most essential and justified cases in comparison to the past. But any further reduction in this area runs the risk of exacerbating tensions between the health staff and the refugees, which could negatively influence the programme. AMDA and UNHCR should jointly explain the constraints to the refugees and seek better understanding and cooperation from them.

4a. Nutrition Survey

- The Mission noted that the 8.79% prevalence of malnutrition in the under-5 population, as reported by the annual nutrition survey in 2005, is high when compared to the WHO standard of 5% for a stable population. Some deficiencies in the survey were evident. Lack of proper definitions, the sampling technique, and generalisation of the finding from a small sample were some of the areas which undermine the validity of the survey. The figure of 8.79% is also found to be quite high when compared to the 2% prevalence reported in the annual mass screening. Even though mass screening uses the Weight for Height (WFH) median and the
annual survey uses the Z score such a big difference in the figures cannot be explained.

- AMDA also reports in the survey a higher prevalence of Angular stomatitis (AS) a deficiency due inadequate intake of vitamin B2 in the under-5 population. Given the subjectivity of using clinical signs in the identification of micronutrient deficiency diseases, this could not be substantiated by the random checks conducted in the camp by the Mission. This problem appeared more evident in the school age group than the under-fives. In addition, there are no quantitative data available so far on Iron deficiency.

- Because a determination of the nutritional status is very important for evaluation and for future planning purposes, the Mission recommends a quality nutrition survey with expert guidance in 2006. The mission also recommends that population based external nutrition assessments be planned every two years.

- It is suggested that standard case definitions be followed in reporting micro nutrient deficiencies. Since symptoms of AS could be misleading due to several causes, the Mission recommends that children showing active signs should be provided treatment with riboflavin as per WHO guidelines and followed up to establish the link between the symptoms and underlying riboflavin deficiency. In addition, the forthcoming survey should include an assessment of iron deficiency anaemia using biochemical methods.

4b. Supplementary Feeding Programme

- The current SFP provides dry take-home rations of WSB, Sugar and Oil on a weekly basis to all pregnant and lactating women and children 6-11 months of age irrespective of their nutritional status. In addition, malnourished children from 1-5 years of age are registered in the supplementary feeding programme. The Mission observed that the duration of stay of malnourished children in the supplementary feeding programme is unacceptably high. The average duration of stay, as quoted by AMDA, is about two hundred days. Some children were even kept for over a year. There are currently about 219 malnourished children in the supplementary feeding programme using weight-for-height criteria.

- The profile of all the malnourished children in the SFP should be collected and possible causes of malnutrition identified and addressed. Children who have been found to have congenital disorders or disability should be categorized as “disabled “and not included in the feeding programme as “malnourished”. Periodic medical follow-up of these children and documentation of their progress is strongly encouraged. More pro-activeness on the part of the nutrition and MCH staff of the AMDA clinic is needed to address the problem of malnutrition. The Mission also recommends better supervision of the nutrition activities and guidance to the staff by AMDA.

4c. HIV and AIDS

- The Mission observed that activities carried out in the area of HIV prevention to be largely satisfactory. But there were several non-conventional locations in the camps identified by the Mission where condoms could be made available more freely. It is therefore suggested that condom promotion in camps be strengthened, particularly targeting the youth and men.
4d. Water and Sanitation

- The water system is managed centrally and operated by incentive workers. In all seven camps the water system is centrally controlled and distributed through pipes. The approximate quantity is within established guidelines, i.e. 20 – 25 liters per person per day. The water is pumped from deep wells by diesel engines to overhead tanks where the water is then chlorinated and subsequently distributed through pipes two to three times per day to tap stands located throughout the camps. The maximum distance from the refugee residence to the nearest tap stand is about 150 meters. The water quality is tested twice per month by taking samples from the overhead tanks, collection points at the tap stands, and household containers. Faecal coliform does not exist at the collection points. Water quality results are shared with public health organizations and are regarded as the best in the area of operation.

- One latrine is provided for two households a few meters away from their dwellings to allow them easy and safe access to latrines with privacy. The latrines are equipped and ventilated with double pits. When one of the pits is filled, the refugees switch it to another pit with the ventilation pipe. Sanitation volunteers also assist in repair and maintenance of the latrines. Bamboo and roofing material are provided to refugees and they themselves carry out the repair works on voluntary basis. The Mission concluded that the water and sanitation situation in the camps is very good and is meeting standards.

5. Food Basket

5.1. The food basket was found to be meeting the average caloric needs of 2100 per person per day and most of the essential micronutrients by providing five basic commodities, fortified blended food (WSB) and small amounts of fresh vegetables. The inclusion of WSB in the food basket has greatly enhanced the nutrition value and is now meeting the standards as well as containing outbreaks of vitamin B deficiencies. Refugees, both adults and children, seem to like the WSB and the Mission was encouraged to observe the way WSB was cooked and consumed. However, concerns were raised about the quantity and quality of the fresh vegetables provided. The seasonal fresh vegetables provided on a weekly basis present quality problem, especially the green leafy and watery vegetables. The primary aim of providing small amounts of vegetables appears to diversify the food and enhance palatability of the existing diet rather to address micronutrient deficiencies, in particular Vitamin Bs. It is encouraging to note that to date no breaks in the pipeline were observed and all basic commodities were distributed in a timely manner.

Food Basket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Quantity (g/p/d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parboiled Rice</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Gram</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentils</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSB</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Vegetables</td>
<td>260 g/p/w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Targeting of Assistance

6.1. The GoN maintains its policy of prohibiting refugees from officially and legally engaging in economic activities outside the camps. It is known that some refugees live/work illegally outside the camps to supplement their daily needs not met by the agencies.

6.2. As observed by the Mission, targeted food assistance can be achieved only if the office has adequate data for analysis through a socio-economic survey on food security, earning capacities and employment opportunities.

6.3. Due to the budgetary constraints faced by UNHCR, some form of targeting of assistance in non-food items, especially in shelter, has been achieved. This was possible only through dialogue with and the co-operation of the refugee community. Targeting is a sensitive issue and needs to be addressed with caution and transparency as any further cuts would have an adverse effect for staff working in the camps. However, for those who are trained and leave the camps for better job opportunities outside, assistance provided to them in the camps should be reviewed.

7. Food Distribution and Monitoring

7.1. A total number of 106,197 refugees were registered in the camps as of 31 May 2006. In May 2006, WFP and UNHCR provided a general ration to a total of 104,252. The difference of 1,945 is attributed to the absentees, many of whom have been outside the camps for a long period of time. Absenteeism from the camps is caused by the migration to third countries, plus education and work outside the camps.

7.2. Each camp consists of 4-12 sectors, which are further divided into sub-sectors with an average population of 80-110 families (around 500 persons). Each sector and sub-sector has representatives, supervised by CMC. A sub-sector is considered as a distribution unit for both food and non-food assistance. Sub-sector heads and their assistants are elected annually among the adult refugees under general supervision of the RCU camp officials.

7.3. For the distribution of dry rations, WFP is responsible for the Extended Delivery Point (EDP) and UNHCR for the Final Distribution Point (FDP) management. Both activities were managed by the Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) until January 2006. For better management and cost effectiveness, both WFP and UNHCR decided to use a single partner to do food and Non-Food Items (NFI) distribution. LWF became the natural choice considering their involvement in local development and their ability to move programmes from care and maintenance to development. LWF has been managing the EDP and FDP since February 2006. A community-based approach is used for the food distribution. Refugees themselves are directly involved in the fortnightly distributions under the supervision of a distribution sub-committee and LWF.

7.4. There are fixed distribution days in each camp. On the rare occasions when food commodities arrive late at the camp warehouses, an additional distribution day is organized to catch up. To date, there have been no breaks in the pipeline and all basic commodities have been distributed. In general, the Mission concluded that the distribution system in place seem to functioning well. The refugee community, as well as the beneficiaries, seems to be satisfied with this approach. The Mission made some observations where modifications may be required in consultation with the IPs and CMC for better accountability and transparency.

7.5. The record management by LWF related to births, deregistration (due to absence and death) and issuing of ration cards is not clear. The information is available but it is not consolidated. There are different types of cards issued for different services
provided to the refugees. Food ration cards are held by the sub-sector heads whereas health and census cards are held by the refugees. There seems to be reluctance on the part of sector heads to give the cards to individual refugees for fear of individual refugees losing the cards.

7.6. Some ration cards and log books were not signed by the sub-sectors heads and some refugees did not sign off on ration collection. Further, the same information is being recorded in ration cards as well as on the register. If the cards stay with the sub-sector head, there is no point of recording the information twice. The ration card is issued in the name of male or female head of the household but the ration is collected by other members of the family and in some cases by friends or relatives as well. There is only one LWF staff assigned to supervise the distribution. This staff member not only supervises the distribution but carries out other responsibilities related to NFI distribution.

7.7. The distribution is supervised by LWF staff and monitored by WFP and UNHCR, in accordance with humanitarian and protection principles. However, the Mission noted limited presence of LWF staff at the distribution centers. It was also noted that LWF staff are not clear about their roles and responsibilities for the supervision of the food monitoring. There is a need for developing a common understanding about the roles and responsibilities of each organization and then translating the understanding into a tripartite agreement. However, before developing such agreement, it will be necessary to map out the existing distribution system and develop standard operating procedures to enhance a common understanding of the distribution system.

7.8. Both UNHCR and WFP have responsibilities for ongoing monitoring and reporting. UNHCR and WFP field staff should undertake such activities jointly at distribution sites and at the household level. In addition, it will be useful to collect market prices for food and NFI on a monthly basis. The information is useful in estimating the quantity of food sold and the impact of the sales on local markets.

7.9. The food basket monitoring is carried out by AMDA. The scales used at the food basket monitoring hut are very old. The data collection is done early in the morning, collecting 10 samples mainly serving one family size. The other family sizes are not covered in the data collection. The monitoring counter is staffed by a refugee volunteer. In view of the above, the Mission suggests the following to improve on operations at the camp level.

- **Record management should be reviewed and simplified in order to consolidate the information and give confidence to CMC to relinquish control of the ration cards.**
- **Ration cards should be given to individual refugees after improving the records management system. The ration cards should be amended to include the names of the ration collectors with specimen signatures.**
- **LWF should assign a full-time, dedicated staff person who is responsible for monitoring the distribution process and ensuring compliance.**
- **RCU Supervisors, WFP/UNHCR Monitors, LWF staff, the Distribution Committee and sub-sector heads should be given on-the-job training on the distribution system.**
- **To enhance a common understanding of the distribution system among all stakeholders, the current distribution system should be mapped out and standard operating procedures (distribution guidelines) should be developed.**
- **A tripartite agreement should be developed to document the common understanding on the roles and responsibilities of each agency.**
- The old scales at the food basket monitoring sheds should be replaced with new ones.
- The food basket monitoring sample should contain different family sizes.
- The food basket monitoring data collection should be carried out by national staff instead of refugee volunteers. Alternatively WFP/UNHCR monitors should randomly collect the data and do a separate analyses to check the validity of the findings of the food basket monitoring.

7a. Final Distribution Point (FDP) Management

- WFP globally managed the food up to the Extended Delivery Point (EDP) and UNHCR managed the Final Distribution Point (FDP) until July 2002. With WFP’s streamlining of operation, linking all aspects of food distribution from port to the final destination, the July 2002 version of the global MOU between UNHCR and WFP made provisions for WFP taking over the responsibility of final distribution on a case by case basis in agreements between the Heads of WFP and UNHCR at the country level. In this context the mission suggests further discussion be held between the WFP and UNHCR representatives in Nepal on responsibilities for FDP management.

7b. Logistics

- Most of the commodities for this operation are purchased locally to date by the WFP Nepal except the in-kind donation of commodities. While the seasonal constraints for the procurement of parboiled rice are well recognized, particularly during the rainy season, the logistical arrangement for the procurement and delivery of WFP food commodities are generally found to be adequate. However, in cases of late confirmation of funding, the timely delivery of the commodities by the delayed finalization of contracts with the local suppliers presents a challenge.

- Delivery of WFP locally-procured commodities is direct to camp warehouses managed by LWF. As a safety measure, WFP tries to maintain a 1-2 month buffer stock in all the camp warehouses to cover any unexpected delays in delivery and also to make it easier for the food management committees and LWF to reject commodities that they identify as being below the contractual specifications.

- In the event that WFP receives commodities in-kind, they are transported from Calcutta and either delivered directly to the camp warehouses or stored in a WFP central warehouse in Birtamod with a capacity of some 2,000 mt.

7c. Quality Control

- The WFP commodity specifications for the PRRO are consistent with the Government of Nepal standards. WFP contracted an independent surveyor for quality control, Central Quality Surveillance (CQS), with an office in Damak. Samples of vegetable oil and WSB are regularly collected from camp warehouses and sent to Delhi for testing of micro-nutrient contents. Other commodities are inspected regularly by CQS upon arrival in the camps and commodities not meeting WFP specifications are rejected/returned by LWF. Additionally, the refugees have the right to reject commodities deemed unacceptable at the camp warehouse based on visual inspection. If a particular batch is suspected as being unfit by the food management committee, it remains in waiting until cleared or rejected by CQS after quality tests.
- The Mission found that the quality control system in place is functioning well. There were no complaints received about the quality of food being distributed.

7d. Contingency Planning

- UNHCR and WFP did a commendable job during the long bandh in view of the logistical contingency plan put in place. During the implementation, it was learned that there was still some room for improvement. The plan is built on the assumptions that the commercial trucks will be available for hiring under a stand-by agreement and fuel will be available in the market place but accessing these services during the political crisis became extremely difficult. Since the political crisis is not fully resolved yet, provision should be made for transport, fuel and buffer stocks of food commodities and essential non-food commodities, as a preparedness measure in UNHCR and WFP country plan.

8. Non-food Items

8a. Cooking fuel and Kerosene

- To prevent environmental degradation around the camps resulting from the pressure of the refugee population on the nearby forest despite a regular supply of kerosene, briquettes were identified as the most viable alternative fuel for cooking and were introduced in January 2006. UNHCR proactively involved the GoN in supporting the efforts in implementing the change. Following an assessment on the quantity requirement, the ration was revised in February 2006. The current ration is 25 kg/month for family of 1-5 members, 30 kg./month for 6-10 and 35 kg/month for family size of 11 and above. Supplies are procured through a competitive tendering process. The Mission found that the quantity given to refugees is reasonably sufficient to meet their cooking needs. (Annex VI)

- Regular training on efficient use of briquettes is desirable. It is anticipated that the switch from kerosene to briquettes will positively impact the relationship of refugees and local communities by providing potential for an income- generating activity and community partnership, which could be enhanced if it is produced locally by the local communities. For this purpose, UNHCR is to implement a pilot project to assess the feasibility of the production of briquettes locally. In addition metal chimneys also are being provided for safe environment. One liter of kerosene per month per family is provided for lighting and ignition of briquettes. Refugees did express their concerns about non-availability of wood chips to ignite the briquettes; however the Mission noted that this is well managed by the refugees. Additionally, a new NGO is planning to distribute parabolic solar cookers to the refugees in 2006 and 2007 from its own resources, and a great majority of the refugees are expected to benefit from the solar cookers once they are installed.

8b. Shelter

- UNHCR had been providing assistance in the repair and maintenance of shelters and latrines to all refugees on a regular basis since 2000. However, due to budgetary constraints, UNHCR targeted the assistance in “repair and maintenance of refugee shelters and latrines” in 2005 to vulnerable families only. Additionally, emergency repair support was provided to the refugee shelters damaged by natural calamities.
The Mission observed that the camp infrastructure is maintained reasonably well. Despite this, some vulnerable families may be excluded from the list of targeted assistance as they are less vocal than others. Constant and close monitoring should be done to ensure that those who are in genuine need receive the targeted assistance.

9. Partnership and Coordination

9.1. Most implementing partners are dependent on UNHCR and WFP funding. However, some of the IPs bring additional resources, mainly in the area of shelter, education and community services-related activities, and in host-community development. The Mission suggests that the contributions from the IPs be harmonized so that the priority needs of refugees are addressed first. UNHCR has consolidated IPs arrangements thereby optimizing use of the scarce resources by reducing operational support and other recurrent administrative costs. Starting from January 2006, the LWF took over the NRCS activities such as procurement and distribution of vegetables, fuel for cooking and other NFIs. WFP also handed over the responsibility of food items from NRCS to LWF. It is too early to assess the performance of the IPs on the new responsibilities, but so far the impression is positive. Similarly, the ambulances were handed over to AMDA by DPHO.

9.2. On policy matters, UNHCR and WFP closely work with the Ministry of Home and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on refugee-related policy matters. At the field level a close coordination is maintained with the RCU in terms of refugee security, camp management, refugee screening, identification and documentation. Close relations with the implementing partners are also maintained. The Mission was encouraged to note the active role of the district authorities for the first time in many years. The District Deputy Director has visited all seven camps and has shared his observation with the Mission. In addition, the local authorities agree with many of the recommendations made by the JAM team in the context of durable solutions.

9.3. The refugees are actively involved in the management of the camps, and in the implementation of all assistance activities. Members of the Camp Management Committees, and different Sub-Committees of the CMCs, and other informal refugee organizations such as Bhutanese Refugee Women’s Forum (BRWF), Children’s Forum (CF), Bhutanese Refugees Aiding for Victims of Violence (BRAVVE), Bhutanese Health Association (BHA) and the Bhutanese Refugee Representative Repatriation Committee (BRRRC), are actively involved in various decision-making processes. As a strategy to ensure better, comprehensive and sustainable services to the refugees, UNHCR Nepal attempted to strengthen its ties with other sister UN agencies. Closer networking with UNFPA was achieved in an attempt to comprehensively address the reproductive health needs of the refugees. A joint concept note for conducting mobile reproductive health camps within the refugee camps has been submitted to funding agencies. This would be the first time that UNHCR is closely collaborating with any other UN agency, apart from WFP, for provision of assistance to the Bhutanese refugees. (Annex VII/VIII)

9.4. UNHCR staff, refugees, and implementing partners, together with WFP and governmental counterparts carried out a “participatory assessment in operations” exercise in which shared understandings, ownership, and responsibility for achieving common operational goals were reviewed for the benefit of the people of concern.

9.5. It was noted during the discussion with officials of the district public health office that AMDA enjoys a good relationship with the district health authorities (DPHO). AMDA should consolidate this relationship and try to advocate for the
inclusion of refugees in the overall district-level health programming. The DPHO has already been providing support in the form of TB, malaria and family planning supplies, Vitamin A and albendazole tablets for de-worming. The district authorities were also willing to meet any additional supplies if required by AMDA to meet the needs of refugees in the above areas.

10. Self-reliance

10.1. Refugees have not been accorded the right to work or access to agricultural land. While many refugees work outside the camps, mainly as casual laborers, their earnings are far less than what is needed for sustainability. Rather, their outside earning only augments their income to meet their basic needs. The population remains largely dependent on humanitarian assistance. The stalemate situation faced by the refugees, without being able to get on their feet, is of psycho-social concern as well.

10.2. The main objective of the self-reliance activities within the camps is to involve young, old and middle-aged refugees by providing training and capacity-building which will be important for rebuilding their lives once durable solutions are found. These activities are designed with an awareness of the constraints in the camps as well as limited right accorded to the refugees. Funds available through WFP from the sale of empty containers under the PRRO have been utilized for capacity development of refugees since 1994.

10.3. WFP and UNHCR manage a loan scheme project supporting women interested in small businesses like grocery, cosmetic, and furniture shops, dairy, etc. Similarly, since 1998, a vocational training project, with technical assistance from CARITAS, has been operational and provides skill-training to school dropouts to both from the refugee community and the host communities adjacent to the camps (50% respectively). Medically-oriented vocational training activities are supported by WFP and implemented by AMDA. WFP also has been supporting a home gardening project. The project focuses on empowering refugees to manage the Home and Pot-Gardening program on their own. This was achieved through a series of trainings and workshops on seed-preservation and self-sustainable management. The home gardening programme was handed over to the refugee community in July 2004.

10.4. UNHCR, through LWF, has been supporting the Bhutanese Refugee Women’s Forum (BRWF) in empowerment activities at the camp level. They are involved in activities like credit and loan schemes, training and skill development and in production of items like sanitary napkins, chalk, jute mats, baby blankets and bamboo furniture used in the refugee camps. Refugee workers are paid a small incentive for producing items that are consumed by the refugee community itself through programmes run by agencies and implementing partners. Since BRWF is not a registered organization, they cannot officially sell products outside the camp.

10.5. After almost a decade of expanding activities, the camp communities are now quite enthusiastic about the programmes. The initial small projects were able to pave the way for the refugees’ acceptance of larger projects. Plans for continued expansion and improvement of activities are ongoing. To promote greater self-reliance, the following suggestions are offered:

- UNHCR and WFP explore opportunities for enhancing the variety of items to be produced by refugees in the camps.
UNHCR advocates for access to land for expansion of vegetable gardens in and adjacent to the camps.

UNHCR and WFP conduct a joint income generating activity (IGA) assessment to understand the various agencies’ inputs into the Supplementary Income Generation Activity (SIGA) for the refugees in order for trainings and activities to be planned more effectively and spread out proportionately among the refugee population.

The Vocational Training (VT) to be continued with new/additional activities prepared.

A new phase is to be planned for the Home and Pot-Gardening Project.

11. Durable Solutions

11.1. The bilateral process, stalled since December 2003, was revived in late 2005 with informal talks at the UN General Assembly and the SAARC Conference between the Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB) and HMG-N. The new GoN also took up the issue with Bhutan at a high level on the sidelines of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Ministerial Meeting in Malaysia in May 2006, and the GoN hopes that the bilateral dialogue will re-start soon. International recognition of the urgency to find solutions has been mounting within the framework of the Working Group on Resettlement. At present there is a harmonious position among donors that includes the strategic use of resettlement and the potential need to internationalize the issue should bilateral talks produce no tangible results, while recognizing that such resettlement opportunities would not be open indefinitely.

11.2. A perceptible change has been noted within the Bhutanese refugee community of an increasing openness to other durable solutions in addition to repatriation, also a prerequisite for a comprehensive approach. In the open discussions with the CMC members, as well as refugee communities Aorganized for the Mission, they did not exclude resettlement altogether, and some even indicated their wish to be resettled.

11.3. Under the changed political circumstances in Nepal, there are a number of initiatives taken by the refugees to appeal for durable solutions, particularly repatriation.

11.4. The GoN’s initial response to the Mission at the time of the debriefing on 8 June 2006 indicated that within a couple of weeks, the Government would be in a position to provide a response regarding resettlement of vulnerable cases. In regards to resettlement as a durable solution, GoN has indicated that it is not objecting to resettlement as such but stressed its concern over possible picking and choosing of refugees by resettlement countries as well as a potential dynamic which might increase pressure from non-Bhutanese eager to immigrate to the West for better opportunities.

11.5. Vocational and skills training for the refugees carries particular importance as preparation for any durable solution in the future. The Government showed understanding and support for the activities in general, while cautioning the potential implication of such activities in encouraging “local integration” in Nepal.

11.6. It is therefore suggested by the mission that:

- UNHCR and WFP jointly encourage the GoN and GoB to resume discussions to make progress towards durable solutions. It should be recognized that, UNHCR and WFP would not be able to continue the same level of assistance with diminishing donor support.
- UNHCR to conduct a sensitization campaign for refugee communities on comprehensive approaches to solutions. Voices longing for solutions beyond the repatriation should come from the refugees themselves. The consequences of resorting to violence, i.e. jeopardizing any future durable solution, should be emphasized.

- Skills and vocational training activities should be expanded to build the capacities of the refugees for future durable solutions. Such activities for the idle youth would also serve as an enhancement of security. Local communities should also be included in the programme as beneficiaries.

- UNHCR and WFP jointly organize a forum in which an inventive and comprehensive solutions package could be discussed with all stakeholders, including the GoN, donors, other UN agencies, and partner agencies.

12. Host Community

12.1. The presence of the refugees for 15 years is seen as a burden by some groups such as CFUG adjacent to the Bhutanese refugee camps. It is recognized by the local communities that many of the refugees are involved in work such as casual agriculture, construction, stone chipping, firewood vending, working as teachers, health workers and security guards, working in restaurants, raising cows and pigs, carrying out small-scale businesses like tea stalls and grocery shops, working as domestic helpers and investing in property outside the refugee camps. These are seen as taking away opportunities from them and contributing to their unemployment level. Although local people consistently complain about refugees taking their precious natural resources and scarce job opportunities and depriving them from fully benefiting from those resources and services, refugees are generally tolerated. However, the use of forest resources by refugees is a prominent point of contention with the host population. To promote co-existence of the refugee and host community and improve the protection environment for Bhutanese refugees, the following activities are advisable.

- Enhance dialogue and cooperation between Bhutanese refugees and host communities to reduce the persisting tensions and ameliorate relation.

- Advocate for development funding to the host communities from donors and involve both communities for the implementation of such activities.

- Provide support to the local communities for creating more acceptance of the presence of refugees in the community. Actively support host communities, especially the local community forest-user groups, to protect the environment.

- Work towards bridging gaps between the disparity of the standards of services between refugees and the local communities.

- Strengthen the efforts of local communities, refugees and UNHCR for the protection of refugee rights. Extend preventive activities on SGBV, HIV/AIDS and other protection-related issues to the local area that have been successfully implemented for the refugees.

- Harmonize the local area development activities carried out by the implementing partners in order to maximize the benefits to the communities adjacent to the refugee camps.
13. Community Participation and Empowerment

13.1. The participation of refugees in the overall delivery of assistance and camp management is remarkable. The refugee camps are supervised by GoN but managed on a day to day basis by the CMC, an elected body that provides their services on a voluntary basis. The introduction of the secret ballot system and fair and balanced election procedures in the CMC elections conducted in 2006 resulted in an increase of women’s participation in the election process and increased representation of women in the management and distribution committees. As a result, in 2006, representation of women in the camp management committee was 51% and in the distribution committee which manages distribution of food and non-food items it was 67%. Women who are elected as CWT members provide important support and protection to SGBV survivors. To increase accountability, all CMC members sign a Code of Conduct to ensure that they conduct themselves in a fair and impartial manner. (Annex IX)

13.2. Refugee incentive workers have been empowered through skills development and on-the-job training. There are incentive refugee workers in education, health, food delivery and distribution and other services provided in the camp. Refugees have been also supporting the operation by assisting with food off-loading on a voluntary basis.

13.3. Refugees are engaged in economic activities within and outside the camp in skilled and unskilled activities. Although they are able to earn some income to supplement what they are provided in the camps by agencies, they cannot be classified as self-reliant because their income from these activities is not sustainable.

13.4. Since they are not legally allowed to work, they are exposed to exploitation and summary dismissal. Thus, though the refugees are empowered through education, vocational training and a rights-based approach, this is not sustainable since they have no legal right to work. Signs of frustration and anger are obviously being displayed, especially by the youth when faced with no durable solution options, lack of gainful employment opportunities, inability to support their families and no hope for the future. This frustration among the youth and young men was found to be extremely high and if not channeled could become a destructive force in the pursuit of durable solutions. It is therefore suggested that:

- UNHCR and WFP should continue empowerment activities for the refugees and efforts be made to mainstream the youth into activities in the camp and to keep them constructively occupied through the planned youth centres.

14. Protection

14.1. There were reports of 159 cases of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) in 2005, and by the end of May 2006 there were reports of 62 cases of SGBV in the camps. Though efforts have been made in addressing and preventing such incidents, the frustrations resulting from the protracted refugee situation, a lack of hope for the future, idleness, the environment and other adverse factors have resulted in the total number of cases being consistent. The problem of domestic violence due to frustration and alcoholism seems to be very high. This, again, emphasizes the need to find a lasting and comprehensive durable solution for the refugee population.

14.2. UNHCR should continue to strength the mechanisms put in place to address issues of SGBV in the camps in close collaboration with the refugee population.
14.3. Girl trafficking was also identified as an issue of concern in the dialogues with refugees. The need was identified to clearly understand the difference between trafficking and elopement. The issue seems case-specific to some camps where ethnicity plays a major role. Although UNHCR has a list of missing girls, there is a need to understand the causative factors in depth and to develop appropriate strategies to address it.

14.4. A comprehensive study should be undertaken by UNHCR on girl trafficking as it is a matter of concern both to the refugee population and the humanitarian organizations.

15. Unregistered Children

15.1. The issue of unregistered children was brought up by the community in relation to their need for education and food. As a matter of policy, unregistered children living in the camp are entitled to basic rights like food and primary education. According to the RCU, children are unregistered if one of the parents is a non-Bhutanese or they have entered Nepal after their parents were registered or if the child was born outside the camp. In 2005, based on a case by case assessment, a list of unregistered children was provided to WFP and RCU for inclusion in the food distribution list.

15.2. UNHCR should formalize the strategy for supporting unregistered children along with the RCU and review the pending cases. In addition a consolidated monthly list to be submitted to WFP for inclusion in food distribution and to CARITAS for education support.

15.3. Concerning the problem of unregistered children out of mixed marriages residing in the camp, a mechanism should be established by UNHCR on case-by-case assessment in consultation with the RCU.

16. Education

16.1. The refugee education programme run by CARITAS is meeting the education needs of children at the primary and secondary level. In discussions with CARITAS, the problem faced by them is the high turnover of teachers every year. They stated that refugee teachers trained by them were finding employment in Nepal and India where they get higher remuneration. This has an adverse affect on the quality of education that can be provided in the camp schools.

16.2. It is crucial that UNHCR/RCU and CARITAS along with refugee leaders jointly discuss a strategy to address the problem of teacher retention.

*******
Annex I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

WFP/UNHCR Joint Assessment Mission

(a) Background

Bhutanese refugees began entering eastern Nepal in late 1990. By 1993, over 80,000 refugees were granted prima facie refugee status. The number of registered refugees totaled 106,248 in the seven camps (as of December 2005). The operation is considered generally well managed, and the 2004 Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) found the general health and nutrition status of the refugees adequate. There was no JAM in 2005 as was mutually agreed.

Although initial repatriation was scheduled to begin in February 2004, it has not materialized to date because of difference between His Majesty’s Government of Nepal (HMG/N) and the Royal Government of Bhutan surrounding repatriation modalities. Due to the stalled bilateral process and subsequent overshadowing of the refugee issue by the conflict and civil unrest, securing financial support from donors has become increasingly difficult for all agencies involved in this operation.

Portions of the following have been taken from the, “UNHCR/WFP Joint Assessment Guidelines”.

Objectives in relation to the food assistance programme

a. To determine whether and how the performance of the ongoing operation can be improved in relation to the defined objectives for the food security, nutritional status, self-reliance and the general well-being of refugees and host communities.

b. To determine whether the present objectives remain appropriate in the light of the current situation (security considerations included) and prospects for a durable solution, and propose modification if needed.

c. Review food assistance needs in terms of beneficiary group type, including the possibility of positively targeting food assistance.

d. Assess ration card and registration systems in light of their effectiveness and concurrence with standards.

e. Assess self-reliance activities and their current status and impact on food security with a view towards achieving a maximum possible level of sustainable self-reliance pending a durable solution.

f. Review the impact and adequacy of the recent changes (2005) made to food and related nonfood items, more specifically in regard to (i) quality and quantity of food provided (including changes in WFP food basket and UNHCR provisions for fresh vegetables); (ii) food-related NFI supplies (i.e. cooking fuel/utensils).

g. Review of present status of women’s secured access to the food and NFIs with a goal of achieving and maintaining a minimum 80 % participation in the management of food

---

1 The goal of the current WFP’s assistance (PRRO 10058.4) is to contribute to the basic sustenance, health and well-being of registered Bhutanese refugees. The specific expected results are (a) basic sustenance of refugees maintained; (b) restoration and/or maintenance of a sound nutritional and health status of children, expectant and nursing mothers and other vulnerable people; and (c) strengthened coping mechanisms and enhanced skills among refugees and locals in the camp surrounding communities. The 2006 UNHCR’s overall operational goals are to: (a) provide legal and physical international protection to refugees while pursuing durable solutions; (b) identify and implement durable solutions for Bhutanese refugees; and (c) protect the environment and promote a harmonious relationship between refugees and surrounding communities. For sector specific objectives, refer to UNHCR 2006 Letter of Instruction (to be provided in the briefing package).
inputs and ensuring that the participation of refugee women is encouraged and strengthened at the decision making level within the refugee community.

h. Assess the overall nutritional level of the camps based on health and nutritional studies carried out by determining the level of malnutrition causes and remedial measures if any.

i. Assessment of ongoing feeding programmes with attention given for the potential need for the development/implementation of supplementary feeding programmes (based on the WFP/UNHCR Selective Feeding Guidelines) and;

j. Review logistic set-up for food and non-food items, focusing on (i) the effectiveness of Lutheran World Federation (LWF) in handling and distribution,2 (ii) the loss recording system and (iii) the level of operational reserve stocks in light of the current conflict environment.

k. Assess the ongoing security situation and its implications on food security and delivery; devise contingency plan for food-related logistical activities.

l. Assess the extent to which the 2004 JAM recommendations have been implemented and make updated recommendations for the next phase.

m. Support the design and conceptualization of UNHCR and WFP projects for the next planning cycle (12-24 months) by defining:

- The types of food and related NFI assistance required (e.g. utensils, cooking fuel, etc.);
- the planning beneficiary figures;
- modality of delivery, targeting and distribution of food and related assistance; and
- assistance modality for self-reliance activities.

---

2 In January 2006 LWF took over Nepal Red Cross Society responsibilities to handle food and NFI as an implementing partner of UNHCR and WFP.
## ITINERARY FOR JOINT ASSESSMENT MISSION (JAM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival of external participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29 May (Mon.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>UNHCR BO</td>
<td>Briefing with Mr. Abraham (AA), UNHCR Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>WFP CO</td>
<td>Briefing with Mr. Ragan (RR), WFP Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
<td>MOHA</td>
<td>Meeting with Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:05</td>
<td>Ktm Airport</td>
<td>Flight to Biratnagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Biratnagar</td>
<td>Departure for Damak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Damak</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Damak</td>
<td>Security Briefing/ Group Meeting/Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 May - 5 June Jhapa/Morang</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>Camp visits</td>
<td>The team divided in two groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>06 June (Tue.) Kathmandu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>WFP CO</td>
<td>Return to Kathmandu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing with UNHCR/WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 June (Wed.) Kathmandu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise executive summary and key recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 June (Thu.) Kathmandu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>MoFA</td>
<td>Debriefing with MoHA, MoF and MoFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing with donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09 June (Fri.) Kathmandu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>WFP CO</td>
<td>Finalize Report Writing and wrap up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF PERSONS MET DURING JAM 2006

- Mr. Abraham Abraham, UNHCR Representative
- Mr. Richard Ragan, WFP Country Director
- Mr. Jean-Pierre de Margerie, WFP Deputy Country Director
- Mr. Umesh Prasad Mainali, Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs

Chief District Officer Jhapa /Director of Refugee Coordination Unit (RCU)
- Mr. Bhola Prasad Shivakoti – CDO and Director of RCU
- Mr. Murari Prasad Sharma – Deputy Director of RCU
- Nirmal Khanam – Statistician, RCU
- Santosh Duwadi – Section Officer, RCU

Camp Supervisors
- Khudnabari – Mr. D Lamichhane
- Timai- Mr. Sagar Mishra
- Goldhap – Mrs. Nandi Rai
- Beldhangi I – Mr. Khadga Raj Sharma
- Beldhangi II – Ram Raja Subedi
- Beldhangi Extension – Manorath Khanal

Nepal Bar Association (NBA)
- Vice President – Mr. Narayan Bhattarai

Centre for Quality Surveillance Staff
- Khagendra Dhakal (Eastern Camps)
- Binaya Parajuli (Western Camps)

Community Forest User Group (CFUG), Sanischare

Association of Medical Doctors of Asia (AMDA) Staff
- Dr. Nirmal Rimal, Project Director
- Dr. Shanker Prasad Huzdar, Director
- Dr. Sameer Bhattarai, Camp Medical Officer
- Dr. Pankaj Timsinha, Camp Medical Officer

Lutheran World Federation (LWF)
- Dhan B. Sunuwar – Eastern Region Coordinator (ERC)
- Bhadri Maharjan – Deputy ERC

CARITAS
- Father Verky Perekette, Field Director

Vocational Training Centre Staff
- VT Coordinator – Sameer Luitel
- Birtamode Center In charge Bidur Poudel
Debriefing with MOFA/MOHA 08 June 2006

- K. P. Pokharel, Undersecretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)
- Narayan D. Pant, Undersecretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)
- Kabiraj Khanal, Undersecretary, Ministry of Home (MOHA)
- P. B. Shah, Undersecretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOHA)

Donor Representatives Met during Debriefing Meeting 08 June 2006

- Anja Seidel, German Embassy
- Ingrid Deefs, Second Secretary, German Embassy
- Anu Karvinen, Project Officer, Finnish Embassy
- Tanja Suvilaakso, UNICEF Nepal
- Greg Gibson, Third Secretary, British Embassy
- Stephan Schonemann, First Secretary, Embassy Of Denmark
- Charles Prahdan, Environmental Advisor/Fund Coordination, CIDA/CCO
- Loraine Lade, Ambassador, Australian Embassy
- Dr. Rajendra Gurung, RH Special, UNFPA
- Shota Kamishima, Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan
- Jamie Dragon, Political/Economic Officer, US Embassy
- Narendra Gurung, Senior Programme Officer, JICA Nepal
### Annex IV

**CAMP POPULATION BY AGE & GENDER as of 31 March 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Bel. 1</th>
<th>Bel. 2</th>
<th>Bel. 2ext</th>
<th>Gol.</th>
<th>Khu.</th>
<th>San.</th>
<th>Tim.</th>
<th>Gender number</th>
<th>M/F % of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>106,662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,436</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>32,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,331</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59</td>
<td>58,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,415</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51.04%</td>
<td>48.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population By Camp: Gender and Family Size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th># of Families</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th># of Huts</th>
<th>Persons Per Hut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELDANGI-1</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>9,361</td>
<td>8,974</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELDANGI-2</td>
<td>22,542</td>
<td>11,467</td>
<td>11,075</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELDANGI-2ext</td>
<td>11,594</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>5,672</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDHAP</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHUDUNABARI</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANISCHARE</td>
<td>20,993</td>
<td>10,770</td>
<td>10,223</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMAI</td>
<td>10,293</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106,662</td>
<td>54,436</td>
<td>52,226</td>
<td>15,034</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>16,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51.04%</td>
<td>48.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex V

LOCATION OF REFUGEE CAMPS IN MORANG AND JHAPA
Registered Camp Population (as of 31 March 2006): 106,635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELDANGI I, II &amp; EXTENSION</td>
<td>52,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHUDUNABARI</td>
<td>13,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDHAP</td>
<td>9,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMAI</td>
<td>10,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANISCHARE</td>
<td>20,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
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- District boundary
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- Refugee Camp

Population figure provided by UNHCR
WFP-assisted Project Districts -
Assistance to Bhutanese Refugees in Nepal

LEGEND
- INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY
- DISTRICT BOUNDARY
- Bhutanese Refugees Operations districts
## CAMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (CMC) & COMMUNITY WATCH TEAM (CWT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beldangi I</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Durga Psd. Pradhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Bhim Kumari Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Ran Maya Chaulagain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Lal Bdr. Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beldangi II</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Hari Prd. Adhikari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Parbat Biswa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Hari Maya Sanyel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Chandra Bahadur Tiwari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beldangi Extension</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Manorath Khanal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Indra Maya Gurung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Jyoti Chhetri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Megh Nath Khadka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldhap</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Ram Chandra Banskota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Goma Koirala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Radha Devi Thapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Tilachan Adhikari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khudnabari</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Manoj Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Pravina Gurung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Kausila Bhandari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Harka Maya Dahal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanischare</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Menuka Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Champa Singh Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>Trisna Thapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Bhim Bahadur Bhattarai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timai</td>
<td>Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Pursu Ram Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Camp Secretary</td>
<td>Shree Maya Tamang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Focal Point</td>
<td>San Maya Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator of Community Watch Team</td>
<td>Adi Bdr. Darjee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CMC MEMBERS

I undertake to complete my stipulated tenure as an elected representative of the community.

As an elected representative of the community, I will:

- Treat all refugees with respect and dignity;
- Perform my duties and conduct myself in an impartial, fair, and transparent manner;
- Contribute to building a harmonious and effective team of CMC members to support refugees in my camp;
- Prevent and oppose and refrain from all exploitation and physical, sexual or verbal abuse from taking place in the camp;
- Co-operate with all in handling SGBV incidents in the camp;
- Refrain from any involvement in unethical or criminal activities;
- Refrain from any harassment, discrimination, intimidation or favouritism during my tenure as a CMC member;
- Contribute to maintaining a harmonious relation between refugees' community, host community, IPs/NGOs and humanitarian agencies;

Signature:
Name:
Designation:
Address:
Date:
VEGETABLE RATION SCALE (2001-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity per person per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2004-June 2005</td>
<td>Potatoes – 300 grams, Green vegetables (cabbage/banana/pumpkin)- 300 grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onion- 50 grams, Ginger/garlic – 20 grams [TOTAL: 670 grams]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Jan 2006</td>
<td>Vegetables as per its seasonal availability and highest palatability (the items have been agreed as per the table below 250 grams, Ginger/garlic-10 grams (Total:260 grams)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2006 LIST OF PLANNED VEGETABLES FOR DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Items (250 grams/person/week)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Cauliflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Lauka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Lauka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Parwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Raddish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Cabbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Distribution Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fuel For Cooking                  | Family of 1-10 persons: 20 kilograms per family per month in all seven camps for January and February 2006  
Family of 10 and above persons: 30 kilograms per family per month in all seven camps for January and February 2006 |                                                                                                       |
| Compressed Coal Dust (CCD) Briquettes | Family of 1-5 persons: 25 kilograms per family per month in all seven camps for March - June 2006  
Family of 5-10 persons: 30 kilograms per family per month in all seven camps for March - June 2006  
Family of 11 and above persons: 35 kilograms per family per month in all seven camps for March - June 2006  
The quantity per family will depend on the funding availability from July - December 2006 | Quantity and time frame might vary during implementation period subject to available funding and actual need of refugees |
| Honey Comb Briquettes             | A pilot project is planned to be implemented for the production and distribution of honey comb briquette for Goldhap, Khudunabari, Sanischare and Timai camps.                                      |                                                                                                       |
| Cooking Stove                     | 1 cooking stove with a chimney for all families with the first distribution of briquettes                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                       |
| Washing Soap                      | Family of 1-5 persons - 2 units/month  
Family of 6-11 persons - 3 units/month  
Family of 12-17 persons - 4 units/month  
Family of 18 and above persons - 5 units/month |                                                                                                       |
| Baby Blankets                     | 1 for all new born                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                       |
| Sanitary Napkin                   | 2 meter per person per year for all female in reproductive age                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
| Kerosene for lighting             | 1 liter per family/month                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                       |
| Cooking Utensils                  | As per the need when there is an emergency case such as if any family lose them due to fire incident                                                                                                               |                                                                                                       |
| Blankets                          | As per the need when there is an emergency case such as if any family lose them due to fire incident                                                                                                               |                                                                                                       |
| Shelter Repair Materials          | Targeted assistance to the vulnerable families (1,000 families) + approximately 1,000 huts needs emergency repair                                                                                                      |                                                                                                       |
| Latrine Repair Materials          | Latrine roof replacement - approx. 2000 family latrines  
Sunken Latrine Repair - approx. 500 family latrines                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |