Cabo Delgado & Nampula
27th January 2021
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Situation Overview

- Tropical Cyclone Eloise made landfall in Beira on 23 January (2 am), with winds of 140 km/h and gusts up to 160 km/h. The epicenter of the cyclone was reported to be in Buzi district.

- After the landfall, Beira received 250 mm of rain in 24 hours, according to INAM, while other areas that were flooded ahead of Eloise’s landfall—including Buzi and Nhamatanda—also received additional heavy rains.

- Sofala province has been hardest hit (162,305 people impacted), especially in Buzi, Dondo and Nhamatanda districts and Beira City, according to INGD/CENOE.

- Eloise also caused damage and flooding and left roads impassable in parts of Zambezia (12,209 people impacted), Inhambane (445), Manica (646) and Gaza (870) provinces.

- by Tropical Cyclone Idai and by Tropical Storm Chalane,

• **Situation Overview**

- In Beira city, the **Munhava barrio and Praia Nova** are both areas of concern, with provincial authorities reporting damages and flooding in both locations.

- The **predominant concern remains the risk of severe flooding**. Many rivers in Mozambique’s central and southern regions, which Tropical Storm Eloise impacted, are above the alert levels.

- According to the DNGRH, the **Buzi and Pungoe basins** are above the **alert level** is increasing, with the risk of more floods. The water levels in the **Save River basin** are currently above the **alert level**, posing a flood risk to the villages of Nova Mambone, in Govuro, Inhambane Province, and Machanga, in Sofala Province. Above the **alert level** is also the **Limpopo River basin** which might also lead to flooding.
• Preliminary reports on impacts

• According to INGD, **Cyclone Eloise affected at least 176,475 people, including 8,363 displaced.** INGD also reported **12 people injured and 6 deaths. A total of 8,363 people have been evacuated.**

• **32 accommodation centres have been activated** in Sofala province: Beira (14 centres, 9,437 individuals), Nhamatanda (5 centres, 1,885 individuals), Buzi (10 centres, 3,344 individuals), and Machanga (3 centres, 854 individuals), according to IOM/INGD, while nine accommodation centres activated in Dondo and Muasa districts have been deactivated by INGD.

• **More than 8,800 houses have been destroyed, damaged or flooded**, mainly in Sofala Province, and **over 160 classrooms and at least 26 health centres** will need repairs. Some roads, mainly in Buzi district, but also in Sena and Makossa districts of Manica Province, are impassable, hampering access to some villages.

• **More than 142,150 hectares of crops have been flooded**, which could impact the next harvest in April. Several damages to public infrastructures were also reported.
• Coordination, Needs Assessments and Response
  • INGD/COE Sofala

• **Monitoring visits** (Buzi, Nhamatanda and Cidade da Beira) were undertaken and awareness-raising activities carried out to approximately 1,500,000 people, in areas at high risk of flooding, led by the President of INGD, Secretary of State and Governor.

• WFP has mobilized supplies to provide **food assistance to 100,000 people**. A total of 640 metric tonnes of food is already available in WFP’s hubs in Beira and Maputo and will be distributed in the coming days to people who need it most. UNICEF Emergency Specialists have arrived in Beira and **emergency stocks are pre-positioned for response**.

• Preliminary resources mobilisation
  • Given the nature of the crisis (rapid onset), it is suggested that the HCT put forward an application to the **CERF Rapid Response (RR) window**, in an effort to mobilise some immediate funds to kick start the response
Sites Update:

METUGE

Metuge Temporary sites
- WASH concerns, particularly Nangua and Centro Agrario – not enough latrines. Also, 25 de Junho
  Lack of latrines, lack of hygiene

Namuapala to Cuaia
- Namuapala closed. HH from Namuapala to Cuaia reported. CCCM is following up today.

Manono being closed
- AeA and IOM are replanning the site to allow for improved conditions and an emergency type A
  shelter distribution.

Ntocota
- Cholera cases reported – 60 HHs left and 1 returned already.
- Latrines: 200 due to go in by AeA or MSF – to be discussed

Ngalane
- Tensions community and IDPs - Protection and CCCM space identified.
- Wash problems - Latrines are still not in a good status. Water point (far end of the site) is bad
- Verification was carried out, there has been manipulation with the HHs numbers. AeA are following up on this and will
  share feedback.

Naminawe
- 800 HHs demarcation completed – No IDPs yet
Sites Update:

CHIURE

Meculane
- Caritas/CRS working on 40 houses in the site. First training of the group. Later they will ramp up construction to 100 HH at a time.
- Caritas: shelter phase 1 support as planned CCCM will support with activities for women and children.

Katapua and Marrupa
- No organizations have reached out.
- CCCM has constructed an info point and communal shade in Marrupa and is working to do the same in Katapua this week.

Metota
- Assessment report was shared to ICCG and cluster leads have the report.
- CCCM will discuss Water issues at site with WASH
Sites Update:

ANCUABE

Nanjua A
• Update on verification: Caritas-
• Relocations from bairro de Nanjua A to take place on the 6th February?

Nanjua B
• Reports that IDPs are leaving due to a lack of water.

Natove
• Site clearance is ongoing. Site is nearly ready.
• Caritas will be the shelter partner here.

Cujupane
• 970 plots, site clearance taking longer
Sites Update:

MONTEPUEZ

Nicuapa

• Receiving people daily at site
• SDPI asked to stop distributions (500 families to be confirmed)
• Complaints were received on not being a part of the distribution – PDM.

Mapupulo 1 and Mapupulo II site

• The lists were not complete. Way forward is to digitize lists, start distributions.
Inter-Cluster updates

Matters arising from the previous HCT meeting (OCHA)
• Security update
• Analysis of the most flooding area in IDP sites and urban areas.
• Updates on the Cholera break-out situation in Montepuez

ICCG meeting
• CCCM multisectoral tool: to finalize the tool.
• Transportation guidelines

Protection cluster updates
• For protection mainstreaming, protection cluster received request for protection support for some clusters’ activities, including verification exercises. The aim is to reach out to clusters bilaterally to discuss how to best support protection mainstreaming in the response.
• Update on the CD PSEA Network – The PSEA Network was established.

Preparation of upcoming rapid assessment and response missions
• Upcoming rapid assessment and response missions in key districts such as Mueda, Montepuez, Palma, Ibo and Macomia.
• On Palma, UNHAS resumed its activities and OCHA encourages to continue their support as additional displacements have been recorded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No. of Beneficiaries Planned</th>
<th>No. of Beneficiaries Reached</th>
<th>% Reached</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancuabe</td>
<td>75,845</td>
<td>24750</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balama</td>
<td>10,145</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiure</td>
<td>42,375*</td>
<td>7780</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibo</td>
<td>21,265</td>
<td>10860</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meluco</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>January Distributions complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuge</td>
<td>122,935*</td>
<td>47830</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montepuez – In-kind</td>
<td>20,140</td>
<td>16110</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montepuez - CBT</td>
<td>33,565</td>
<td>18510</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>January Distributions in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangade</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>January Distributions on hold (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueda</td>
<td>73,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>January Distributions on hold (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemba - CBT</td>
<td>220,140*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>January Distributions have not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>661,850</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>132645</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution campaign figures update - FAO
# FAO distribution (e-voucher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancuabe</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiure</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metuge</td>
<td>3539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montepuez</td>
<td>3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namuno</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meconta Nampula</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 10969
FAO distribution (in kind)

- Meluco: 513
- Chiute: 320
- Quissanga: 290
- Total: 1123
**Agriculture & Livelihoods Activities**

Total number of HH assisted:
- **33,701 HH**
- **1000 HH**

**PARTNER**
- ADEL
- Arcos Ires
- Care
- Caritas
- Cesal
- FAO
- ICRC
- Instituto Oikos
- Save the Children
- UNDP
Planed Beneficiaries.

Chiure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>2,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries Reached.

Chiure

Total: 2,812
Planed Beneficiaries.

Montepuez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>9,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries Reached.

Montepuez

Total: 9,241

- FAO: 3,137
- Red Cross: 1,498
- Save: 4,606
Beneficiaries Reached

Namuno

[Map of Namuno]

Bar chart showing the number of beneficiaries reached:
- FAO: 1839
- Caritas: 390
Planed Beneficiaries

Metuge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>5,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries Reached

Metuge

Total: 5,829
Planned Beneficiaries

Ancuabe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,118</td>
<td>2,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Beneficiaries Reached**

**Ancuabe**

![Map of Ancuabe](image)

- **Total:** 2,229
  - **FAO:** 1,839
  - **Caritas:** 390
Planed Beneficiaries

Mecufi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries Reached

Mecufi

![Map of Mecufi with beneficiaries bar chart]

- Care: 1200
- Cesal: 920
- Caritas: 83
Beneficiaries Reached

Pemba

Caritas

5095
Beneficiaries Reached

Quissanga

Map of Quissanga area with a bar chart showing 290 beneficiaries reached by FAO.
Planed Beneficiaries

**Meluco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planed</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries Reached

Meluco

Map of Meluco with a bar chart showing 570 FAO beneficiaries reached.
Beneficiaries Reached

Ibo

Red Cross

100

1
Beneficiaries Reached.

Quirimbas
Beneficiaries Reached.

Matemo

Red Cross

- Pemba
- AWG
- Beneficiaries Reached.
- Matemo
- Red Cross
## Not Reached Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montepuez</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancube</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obrigado
Nampula Province
Situation and interventions

General Overview

Courtesy of UN-HABITAT
Structure

HCT – Humanitarian country team

* FSWG – Food Security Working Group at Nampula level*

FAO, WFP, UNHCR, PLAN, CEDES, CARITAS NACALA, HELPO
• Around 63,948 IDPs (INGD data 26.01.2021) 53.81% children

• 18 Districts (of 23)

• Meconta, Nampula, Nacala-Porto and Memba – principal hosting Districts

**Corrane** IDPs Resettlement

Around 2,200 people

59% children (under 18)

37 shelters still available
500 families in tents
130 improved shelters available
• No plans for other resettlement camps

• Discussion ongoing for decentralization at District level – each District to find reallocation sites and access to land for IDPs

• Nampula and Rapale Districts may be the first to reallocate at district level (to confirm)

• Training of Districts technicians planned in the following week by OIM – infrastructural planning

• Advocacy for more initiatives of small scale in the Province – not focus only in Corrane

---

**WFP Food assistance cycle just started**

Bimonthly distributions in 17 Districts

Target around 60.000 people
Food Security Survey in Pemba City and District of Montepuez

September-October 2020
**IDPs by age group (%)** (Source: SEPPA+ WFP beneficiary lists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Pemba</th>
<th>Montepuez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-18 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-59 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;59 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sex of head of IDPs HH in Pemba and host HHs in Montepuez (%)** (source: Pemba and Montepuez surveys)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Pemba</th>
<th>Montepuez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origin of IDPs (%)** (source: SEPPA+ WFP beneficiary lists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Pemba</th>
<th>Montepuez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Praia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quissanga</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muidumbe</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meluco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other districts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures: Food Share (%)**

- Pemba: 52%
- Montepuez: 50%

**Expenditures: Food Share ( meticais)**

- Pemba: 3,960
- Montepuez: 1,758

**Expenditures: Total HH monthly (food and Non-Food) (Meticais)**

- Pemba: 7,615
- Montepuez: 3,516

**Income informal sources - casual labor, other businesses**

- Pemba: 56
- Montepuez: 19

**Income source - salary and pension**

- Pemba: 21
- Montepuez: 5
Cabo Delgado: Food Consumption Score (FCS): % of HHs with Insufficient food intake (poor and borderline). (Source: WFP monthly mVAM)

Cabo Delgado: Food Consumption Score (FCS) by Zone - % HHs with Insufficient Food Intake (Poor and borderline FCS) (source: SETSAN National FSN assessment Aug- Sep 2020)

Cabo Delgado: Food Consumption Score (FCS) in Pemba ad Montepuez - % HHs with Insufficient Food Intake (Poor and borderline FCS) (source: Assessment in Pemba and Montepuez, Sep- Oct 2020)
Pemba City and Montepuez District: Coping Strategies related to Food (rCSI)

Cabo Delgado-Pemba City: % Host HHs that used Coping Strategies related to food consumption (rCSI) (source: Assessment in Pemba, Sep 2020)

Cabo Delgado-Montepuez district: % Host HHs that used Coping Strategies related to food consumption (rCSI) (source: Assessment in Pemba, Sep 2020)
Cabo Delgado: % Host HHs that used livelihood coping strategies (LCSI) (Source: Assessment in Pemba and Montepuez, Sep-Oct 2020)

Cabo Delgado-pemba city: % Host HHs that used livelihood coping strategies (LCSI) (Source: Assessment in Pemba, Sep 2020)

Cabo Delgado- Montepuez : % host HHs that used Livelihood Coping Strategies LCSI (source: Assessment in Montepuez district, October 2020)
Cabo Delgado: % HH that used reduced Coping Strategies related to Food (source: SETSAN National FSN assessment 2016-2020)

- Pemba City: 36% (2015), 48% (2016), 16% (2017), 36% (2018), 2% (2019)

Percentage of Households that used Coping Strategies related to food (rCSI) (%). Source: SETSAN


Cabo Delgado: Livelihood Coping Strategies (LCSI) (%). (Source: WFP monthly mVAM)

- LCSI Crisis: 4% (Mar-20), 4% (Apr-20), 2% (May-20), 2% (Jun-20), 3% (Jul-20), 2% (Aug-20), 2% (Sep-20)
- LCSI Emergency: 18% (Mar-20), 18% (Apr-20), 10% (May-20), 3% (Jun-20), 12% (Jul-20), 12% (Aug-20), 19% (Sep-20)
### Type of support by host HHs to their IDPs (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Pemba</th>
<th>Montepuez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic goods / kitchen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water sources - % of HH / type

- Piped water: 81
- Boreholes: 7
- Protected wells: 5
- Non-protected wells: 23

### Frequency of food consumption in past 7 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Source</th>
<th>Cereals</th>
<th>Roots and Tubers</th>
<th>Vegetable</th>
<th>Meat</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Oil and fat</th>
<th>Sugar and sugar products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pemba City</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montepuez</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Death and disease - % of HH that faced shocks in past 12 M (Pemba and Montepuez surveys, Sep - Oct 2020)

- Pemba: 58%
- Montepuez: 28%

### Robbery and problems related to access land

- Pemba: 15%
- Montepuez: 19%

### Price increase

- Pemba: 10%
- Montepuez: 6%

### Loss of employment

- Pemba: 5%
- Montepuez: 2%

### Natural shocks

- Pemba: 20%
- Montepuez: 21%
## Pemba City: % of population by indicator and year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households headed by female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of HHs more than 9 members</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : death in the HH in 12 M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : Natural shocks in 12 M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : diseases in 12 M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Share</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income source- salary and pension</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income source- informal businesses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income source- casual labor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH monthly expenditures (in meticais)</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>7,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of crisis and emergency livelihood coping strategies</td>
<td>51 to 96</td>
<td>5 to 42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Households headed by female
- Size of HHs more than 9 members
- Shock: death in the HH in 12 M
- Shock: Natural shocks in 12 M
- Shock: diseases in 12 M
- Food Share
- Income sources
  - Salary and pension
  - Informal businesses
  - Casual labor
- HH monthly expenditures (in meticais)
- Use of crisis and emergency livelihood coping strategies

**Source:** VAM Food Security Analysis
## Montepuez: % of population by indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHs spent 51-75% in food</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted IDPs agriculture as main source of livelihood</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households headed by female</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : death in the HH in 12 M</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : diseases in 12 M</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : Food price increase in 12 M</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : loss of employment in 12 M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock : Natural shocks in 12 M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of HHs 12M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of crisis and emergency livelihood coping strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of water from unsafe sources</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used less expensive and less preferred foods as food-related coping</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used survival strategies related to crisis and emergency livelihoods</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to displaced people, **natural disaster scenarios** that put 29,000 people at risk in the southern districts must be considered.

**COVID-19**: in June, Pemba declared second point with "community transmission" following the rapid evolution of the number of infections in Cabo Delgado capital.

**Difficulties** increased in accessing basic needs, mainly in the areas of health, medicine, food, water and hygiene products (source: community focus group of leaders and women).

Cost of food basket for 5 people (September prices in Pemba):
- with **maize grain**, beans, vegetable oil and salt= 1,420 meticais;
- with **maize flour** instead maize grain = increases to 2,410 meticais;
- with **rice** instead maize grain= increase to 2,530 meticais.

It will be in the southern zone where **resettlement centers** will be created, which generally receive food assistance until the HHs have their fields and crops.
National Food Security preliminary results- IPC analysis (SETSAN, 7 Nov)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincia</th>
<th>Unidade de análise</th>
<th>Fase de Área</th>
<th>Fase de Area</th>
<th>Fase 1</th>
<th>Fase 2</th>
<th>Fase 3</th>
<th>Fase 4</th>
<th>Fase 5</th>
<th>Fase 3 e superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Delgado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conflito afetado)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>341,836</td>
<td>51,275</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nao Afectado)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,726,170</td>
<td>517,851</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidade de Pemba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200,529</td>
<td>60,159</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,268,535</td>
<td>629,285</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Period: October- December 2020

- IPC analysis: 22 Oct- 6 Nov- participation of Provincial and central members of SETSAN, with IPC/ GSU facilitators
- Data collection: August/ September 2020, using remote/ mobile interviews (mVAM)
Other source: National Contingency Plan 2020/21

IDPs from Cabo Delgado:
- 384,000 - Estimated in September (1/3 are children);
- 660,000 - Projection until March 2021.

+ Natural Disasters: 64,800 people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>City inundations</th>
<th>Strong winds/ heavy rain</th>
<th>Drought</th>
<th>Total Cenario I</th>
<th>Floods</th>
<th>Cyclones</th>
<th>Cenario II</th>
<th>Earthquakes</th>
<th>Cenario III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CD</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,320</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>64,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CD survey: FSN and ENA (Essential needs assessment) and process in Metuge district

VAM Mozambique Country Office
January 2021
DEMOGRAPHY

Host community and IDPs by age group

- Children up to 5 years: 18% Host Community HH, 20% IDPs
- From 6-14 years: 32% Host Community HH, 31% IDPs
- From 15-49 years: 38% Host Community HH, 39% IDPs
- > 50 years: 12% Host Community HH, 10% IDPs

Average Household Size

- Host Community HH: 6.8
- IDPs in host HH: 7.5
- IDPs in transit centres: 5.2
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 4.8
**SOURCE OF LIVELIHOOD of HOST HOUSEHOLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Livelihood</th>
<th>Host Community HH</th>
<th>IDPs in host HH</th>
<th>IDPs in transit centres</th>
<th>IDPs in Resettlement Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production and sale of crops</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labour in agriculture</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing and aquaculture</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances or assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and pensions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Aid/Social work</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOD ASSISTANCE

Assistance received by HHs in the last 6 months

- **IDPs in host HH**
  - Food: 80%
  - Cash: 4%
  - Commodity Vouchers: 4%
  - Value Vouchers: 12%

- **IDPs in transit centres**
  - Food: 97%
  - Cash: 0%
  - Commodity Vouchers: 0%
  - Value Vouchers: 0%

- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**
  - Food: 99%
  - Cash: 0%
  - Commodity Vouchers: 0%
  - Value Vouchers: 0%
MAIN SOURCE OF CEREALS

Main source of cereals in last 3 months

- **Host Community HH**
  - Own production: 1%
  - Seasonal work: 16%
  - Loan: 49%
  - Purchase: 34%

- **IDPs in host HH**
  - Own production: 29%
  - Seasonal work: 7%
  - Loan: 3%
  - Purchase: 0%

- **IDPs in transit centres**
  - Own production: 7%
  - Seasonal work: 90%
  - Loan: 3%
  - Purchase: 0%

- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**
  - Own production: 4%
  - Seasonal work: 95%
  - Loan: 3%
  - Purchase: 0%
FOOD DIVERSITY: FOOD CONSUMPTION SCORE

HH per type of family reporting on Food Consumption Score in Metuge

- Host Community HH: 80% ACCEPTABLE, 20% INSUFFICIENT FOOD INTAKE
- IDPs in host HH: 71% ACCEPTABLE, 29% INSUFFICIENT FOOD INTAKE
- IDPs in transit centres: 56% ACCEPTABLE, 44% INSUFFICIENT FOOD INTAKE
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 57% ACCEPTABLE, 43% INSUFFICIENT FOOD INTAKE

ACCEPTABLE
INSUFFICIENT FOOD INTAKE
NUTRITION–DIET OF WOMEN AGED 15 TO 49 YEARS

Percentage of women from households per type of family reporting on MDDW (n=348 α=0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Host Community HH</th>
<th>IDPs in host HH</th>
<th>IDPs in transit centres</th>
<th>IDPs in Resettlement Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of pregnant and lactating women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Host Community HH</th>
<th>IDPs in host HH</th>
<th>IDPs in transit centres</th>
<th>IDPs in Resettlement Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COPING STRATEGIES RELATED TO FOOD (rCSI)

### An Actual Example—Calculating a Reduced Household CSI Score

In the past 7 days, if there have been times when you did not have enough food or money to buy food, how often has your household had to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Frequency Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Universal Severity Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score = Frequency X weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Rely on less preferred and less expensive foods?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Borrow food, or rely on help from a friend or relative?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Limit portion size at mealtimes?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reduce number of meals eaten in a day?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HOUSEHOLD SCORE—Reduced CSI**: Sum down the totals for each individual strategy **28**
### COPING STRATEGIES RELATED TO FOOD (rCSI)

#### Main food coping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of meals</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited food portion size</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive food</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted food consumption</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed or received help on food</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coping strategies related to food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Community HH</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in host HH</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in transit centres</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in Resettlement Centres</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING STRATEGIES RELATED TO LIVELIHOOD (LCSI)

HHs per type of family reporting on livelihood coping strategy

- **Host Community HH**: 76% Stress, 27% Crisis, 9% Emergency
- **IDPs in host HH**: 55% Stress, 9% Crisis, 9% Emergency
- **IDPs in transit centres**: 68% Stress, 22% Crisis, 9% Emergency
- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**: 41% Stress, 30% Crisis, 29% Emergency
MULTIDIMENSIONAL DEPRIVATION INDEX (MDDI) - EDUCATION

Did any school aged child miss school for at least 1 month in the last year?

- Host Community HH: 61% No, 39% Yes
- IDPs in host HH: 83% No, 17% Yes
- IDPs in transit centres: 58% No, 42% Yes
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 42% No, 58% Yes
MDDI - Source of fuel for cooking and lighting

Main source of Fuel for cooking

- Host Community HH: 49% Charcoal, 51% Firewood
- IDPs in host HH: 13% Charcoal, 88% Firewood
- IDPs in transit centres: 2% Charcoal, 97% Firewood
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 2% Charcoal, 98% Firewood

Main source of fuel for lighting

- Host Community HH: 47% Lantern, 51% Electricity
- IDPs in host HH: 71% Lantern, 17% Electricity
- IDPs in transit centres: 81% Lantern, 14% Electricity
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 74% Lantern, 18% Electricity
MDDI-WATER

Main source of drinking water

- **Host Community HH**: 83% Foot With Manual Pump, 10% Piped/public fountains, 1% Protected Well, 1% Water Tank, 6% Water Tank Truck, 1% un.protected well.
- **IDPs in host HH**: 83% Foot With Manual Pump, 2% Piped/public fountains, 1% Protected Well, 1% Water Tank, 3% Water Tank Truck, 1% un.protected well.
- **IDPs in transit centres**: 74% Foot With Manual Pump, 9% Piped/public fountains, 6% Protected Well, 1% Water Tank, 3% Water Tank Truck, 1% un.protected well.
- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**: 33% Foot With Manual Pump, 38% Piped/public fountains, 11% Protected Well, 1% Water Tank, 1% Water Tank Truck, 1% un.protected well.
MDDI- SANITATION

Main latrine type

- Toilet (Sink) with flush
- Toilet (Sink) without flush
- Improved latrine
- Improved traditional latrine
- Not improved traditional latrine
- Communal latrine
- Bush (go into forest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Host Community HH</th>
<th>IDPs in host HH</th>
<th>IDPs in transit centres</th>
<th>IDPs in Resettlement Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilet (Sink) with flush</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet (Sink) without flush</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved latrine</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved traditional latrine</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not improved traditional latrine</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal latrine</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush (go into forest)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOD ASSISTANCE-COMPLAINT AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS (CFM)

HHs that aware of the Complaint and Feedback Mechanisms (CFM)

- IDPs in host HH: 71% aware, 29% not aware
- IDPs in transit centres: 67% aware, 33% not aware
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 61% aware, 39% not aware
CFM

HHs that used CFM

- IDPs in host HH: 57% Yes, 43% No
- IDPs in transit centres: 89% Yes, 11% No
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 80% Yes, 20% No

Did you received feedback

- IDPs in host HH: 100% Yes, 0% No
- IDPs in transit centres: 77% Yes, 23% No
- IDPs in Resettlement Centres: 62% Yes, 38% No
# Security

## Shocks experienced by HHs in past six months

- **Host Community HH**
  - Death of the head or member(s) of the household: 4%
  - Expropriation of land: 3%
  - Fire: 7%
  - Unemployment of the household: 2%
  - Price increase of agricultural inputs (seed, pesticides, etc.): 2%

- **IDPs in host HH**
  - Death of the head or member(s) of the household: 4%
  - Expropriation of land: 4%
  - Fire: 3%
  - Unemployment of the household: 3%
  - Price increase of agricultural inputs (seed, pesticides, etc.): 2%

- **IDPs in transit centres**
  - Drought/ Lack of rain/ irregular rainfall: 3%
  - Chronic illness: 7%
  - Food price increase: 2%
  - Pests or diseases in crops: 2%
  - Theft: 5%

- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**
  - Drought/ Lack of rain/ irregular rainfall: 2%
  - Chronic illness: 7%
  - Food price increase: 5%
  - Pests or diseases in crops: 2%
  - Theft: 5%
IDPs CONCERNS

Main concerns related to food by IDPs

- **IDPs in host HH**
  - No cooking facilities: 4%
  - No cooking fuel: 26%
  - Lack of food availability: 30%
  - No income/money to purchase food: 39%

- **IDPs in transit centres**
  - No cooking facilities: 8%
  - No cooking fuel: 19%
  - Lack of food availability: 35%
  - No income/money to purchase food: 38%

- **IDPs in Resettlement Centres**
  - No cooking facilities: 6%
  - No cooking fuel: 31%
  - Lack of food availability: 34%
  - No income/money to purchase food: 27%
QUESTIONS
National, MOÇAMBIQUE FOOD SECURITY CLUSTER
Strengthening Humanitarian Response
27th January 2021

FSC Response update, January 2020
Food Security and Livelihood Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reached</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Assistance</td>
<td>328,518</td>
<td>475,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods Cumulative</td>
<td>15,530</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Assistance

- Reached: 328,518
- Planned: 475,673

Livelihood

- Reached: 15,530
- Planned: 5,160
Food Assistance Dashboard For The North of Mozambique
As of December 31st 2020

FOOD ASSISTANCE: BENEFICIARIES REACHED BY DISTRICT

- Rapale: 0
- Palma: 0
- Nacala: 0
- Mueda: 0
- Mossuril: 0
- Monapo: 0
- Metuge: 0
- Meluco: 0
- Meconta: 0
- Liúpo: 0
- Ibo: 0
- Cidade_De_Pemba: 0
- Ancuabe: 0

FOOD ASSISTANCE MAP

- Total Beneficiaries Reached
  - Sum of Beneficiaries
  - 0-4,027
  - 4,028-10,948
  - 10,949-38,820
  - 38,820-188,880

LEAD ORGANIZATION

- World Food Programme, Caritas Pemba, Iris Global, CVM, OIKOS

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

- INAR, SEPPA, CCM

PARTNER BY PROVINCE

- Cabo Delgado: WFP, OIKOS, Iris Global, Caritas Pemba, CVM, CCM, INAR, SEPPA
- Nampula: WFP, CCM, INAR
- Niassa: NONE

FOOD ASSISTANCE BY ACTIVITY

- 328,518 Total number of people reached in Cabo Delgado, Nampula and Niassa by Food Assistance
- 187,405 57% GF (CBT/Vouchers)
- 140,633 43% GF (in Kind)

FOOD ASSISTANCE BY SHOCK

- 1 Conflict affected

TOTAL OF DISTRICT REACHED

- 26 District
Beneficiaries Reached In The North Of Mozambique In 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Beneficiaries Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>60,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>96,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>151,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>65,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>171,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>131,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>231,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>235,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>253,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>408,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>322,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>328,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph showing the numbers of beneficiaries reached each month in 2020.
Beneficiaries Reached by Partners In The North Of Mozambique

- **Cabo Delgado**
  - WFP, Iris Global, CVM, Caritas, SEPPA

- **Nampula**
  - WFP, INAR, CCM
Livelihood Dashboard for the North of Mozambique
From May to December 31st 2020

LIVELIHOOD BY ACTIVITY

- **15,530** Total cumulative number of people reached in Cabo Delgado, Nampula and Niassa by Livelihood Assistance by Lead:
  - 3% Istituto OIKOS
  - 6% Caritas Pemba
  - 11% FAO
  - 80% CARE

LIVELIHOOD BY ACTIVITY

- **13,070** Seeds
- **880** Seed Kit 1
- **1,420** Tools
- **160** Training & Capacity Development

LIVELIHOOD: BENEFICIARIES REACHED BY DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Metuge</th>
<th>Mecufi</th>
<th>Namuno</th>
<th>Chiure</th>
<th>Ancuabe</th>
<th>Ibo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAD ORGANIZATION

- FAO, CARE, Caritas Pemba

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

- AVSI

PARTNER BY PROVINCE

- **Cabo Delgado:** Chiure, Mecufi, Metuge, Namuno, Ibo, Pemba
- **Nampula:** NONE
- **Niassa:** NONE

ASSISTANCE BY SHOCK

- **2** Conflict affected Kenneth

TOTAL OF DISTRICT REACHED

- 6 District
Beneficiaries Reached In The North Of Mozambique During the Winter And Main Planting Season 2020

- May: 25455
- June: 0
- July: 160
- August: 2040
- September: 20538
- October: 20636
- November: 10945
- December: 15530
## Beneficiaries Reached by Partners In The North Of Mozambique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Delgado</td>
<td>FAO, CARE, AVSI, Caritas Pemba, Iris Global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CARE International
- FAO
- AVSI
- Caritas Pemba
- OIKOS
FSC Upcoming events

- **5W Matrix circulation:** 30\(^{th}\) January 2021
- **Deadline for submission:** February 5\(^{th}\)

FSC Informations

- 5W Matrix online training (from 1\(^{st}\) to 5\(^{th}\) February 2021)
- 5W Matrix is posted to the FSC website and shared week after the submission date
- The FSC Contact List/Directory and 4/5W Matrix, are updated and posted to the following websites:
- Food Security Cluster: [https://fscluster.org/mozambique/documents](https://fscluster.org/mozambique/documents)
• Estratégia de Livelihoods 2021
• Ferramentas PNUD
• Meluco – WFP