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What is AGORA?

Humanitarian - Development Transition

- WORK MULTI-SECTORALLY
  - Education
  - Health
  - Housing
  - Livelihoods
  - Water & Sanitation
  - Social safety nets
  - Protection

- WORK WITH MULTI-STAKEHOLDER
  - Civil society
  - Local/National government
  - Humanitarian actors
  - Development actors
  - Private sector
  - Donors

- CONSIDER THE WHOLE POPULATION
  - Residents
  - Migrants
  - Displaced Populations
  - Refugees
  - Returnees
  - Hosts

- DEFINE SPECIFIC SETTLEMENTS WITH HIGH NEEDS
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Background

➢ Due to hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) 90,000 people fled to the Republic of Armenia, of which an estimated 36,989 remain displaced.

➢ Those residing in Armenia have had considerable humanitarian needs ranging from shelter, food, health, education, and livelihoods.

➢ Host communities have experienced stress in their capacity to provide basic services such as energy and utilities, education, healthcare, security services, etc.

➢ Compounded by the COVID-19 epidemic in Armenia, the displacement crisis added additional stress on government, host communities and institutions and their capacities to address the essential needs of host communities and people in a refugee-like situation.
Context & Rationale

Intended Impact

➢ This **Capacity & Vulnerability Assessment (CVA)** intends to inform the integration of the **humanitarian-development nexus** in addressing the aftermath of the 2020 shocks in Armenia, through **providing evidence to support targeting the recovery efforts** led by UNDP Armenia and the programming of the Early Recovery Working Group.

➢ The information on services access gained from household (HH) level and service providers aims to support **context-relevant programming** in the specific regions that experienced the heaviest influx of people in refugee-like situation.

➢ The institutional focus of the CVA is geared toward informing interventions aimed at longer term structural change to ensure service provision for all people residing in Armenia.
Specific Objectives

To identify capacity gaps in the provision of public services in the following eleven sectors:

- Housing
- Energy and Utilities
- Waste Management
- Education
- Healthcare
- Employment
- Administrative Services
- Social Services
- Security and Justice Services
- Emergency Services
- Social Cohesion and Peacebuilding
Methodology: Household Survey

- Two structured surveys were developed: a **HH** level survey on access to services and a service provider **key informant survey** to assess service provisions
- For HH surveys, a **total of 1807** (1202 host and 605 refugee-like situation) surveys were accomplished through a stratified random sample
- The research was stratified by both geographic and demographic strata, including **urban** and **rural** host communities, as well as **refugee-like populations**
- The household surveys conducted in Kotayk and Syunik marzes generated findings generalizable with a 95% level of confidence, and a 7% margin of error
- Household surveys conducted in Yerevan generated findings generalizable with a 95% level of confidence, and a 5% margin; refugee-like populations in Yerevan were maintained at a 95% level of confidence, and a 7% margin of error
Methodology: Geographic Coverage

- The study took place in **Kotayk** and **Syunik** marzes, as well as the administrative region of the capital city of **Yerevan**
- Both urban and rural environments were explored, as well as the significantly denser Yerevan landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Kotayk</th>
<th>Sample Size per Strata</th>
<th>Syunik</th>
<th>Sample Size per Strata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>137,900</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>93,200</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee-like Population</td>
<td>11,571</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yerevan</th>
<th>Host Populations</th>
<th>Refugee-like Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Populations</td>
<td>1,084,000</td>
<td>26,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology: Geographic Scope
In total, the key informant survey covered 318 purposefully sampled service providers across the 11 assessed sectors.

The key informant surveys consisted of two parts: general cross-sectoral questions and sector-specific questions.

Cross-sectoral questions provide indicative descriptions of the trends, behaviours, experiences/opinions of the respective service providers across sectors; sector-specific data are indicative and summarize these findings per sector.
Limitations and Challenges

➢ Select survey questions rely on extended recall times (requiring households to recall events prior to the hostilities around NK and the COVID-19 pandemic), which might negatively affect the accuracy of the related findings.

➢ The number of service providers interviewed per sector varies due to time constraints and non-response from some providers.

➢ For this reason, some sectors are over or underrepresented in the findings, and the findings are only limitedly comparable.
Demographics

Gender of the head of HH

Host HHs

- Male: 54%
- Female: 46%

Refugee-like HHs

- Male: 64%
- Female: 36%
Demographics

% of Host HHs reporting having at least one member with one of the following vulnerabilities

- **Elderly (60+)**: 53%
- **None**: 34%
- **Chronically ill**: 30%
- **Physical disabilities**: 11%
- **Pregnant or lactating women**: 7%
- **Unaccompanied/ separated minors**: 1%
- **Mental health problems**: 1%
Demographics

% of refugee-like HHs reporting having at least one member with one of the following vulnerabilities

- Elderly (60+) - 49%
- Chronically ill - 38%
- None - 25%
- Physical disabilities - 22%
- Pregnant or lactating women - 12%
- Unaccompanied/ separated minors - 4%
- Mental health problems - 2%
Key Findings: Housing

- Findings suggest that housing conditions generally remained consistent for host HHs; the majority (88%) reportedly resided in their own apartments before, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic and hostilities in and around NK.

- Conditions appeared more varied for refugee-like HHs, as 49% were renting their apartments, while the rest were living in their own apartments, with host families, or in collective centers.
Housing

Current living situation for host & refugee-like HHs

Host HHs
- We own our apartment/house: 88%
- We rent our apartment/house: 10%
- Other: 2%

Refugee-like HHs
- Staying in rented/paid accommodation: 49%
- Staying in own house: 27%
- Currently residing with hosting households: 17%
- Currently residing in a collective center (or hostel/hotel, etc): 7%
Key Findings: Utilities

➢ The majority of HHs stated that they were **entirely satisfied** with utilities (more than 80% satisfaction level)

➢ Findings suggest that the COVID-19 pandemic and the hostilities in and around NK have not considerably impacted access to utilities among host HHs; **over 90% of host HHs** had access to utilities, compared to **70% of refugee-like HHs**

➢ In the sewerage sector, the most relevant challenges identified by service providers were **clogging in pipes** (11 respondents) and **the need for street network substitution** (14 respondents)

➢ Overall, service providers in all four sectors commonly stated that both COVID-19 and the hostilities in and around NK **did not affect their ability to deliver services**
% of host HHs reporting that COVID-19 and the hostilities in and around NK did not affect their access to utilities

- Electricity: 92% COVID-19, 96% NK
- Gas: 89% COVID-19, 93% NK
- Water: 96% COVID-19, 99% NK
Refugee-like HHs Access to Utilities

% of refugee-like HHs reporting having had access to utilities since arriving in Armenia, by region

- **Yerevan**
  - Gas: 62%
  - Water: 70%
  - Electricity: 60%

- **Syunik**
  - Gas: 90%
  - Water: 90%
  - Electricity: 74%

- **Kotayk**
  - Gas: 90%
  - Water: 90%
  - Electricity: 82%
Sewerage satisfaction level

Reported satisfaction with sewerage services in the 30 days prior to data collection, by % of refugee-like populations and host HHs

- Strongly satisfied: 60% (47% Refugee-like, 33% Host)
- Partly satisfied: 26% (26% Refugee-like, 33% Host)
- Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied: 4% (4% Refugee-like, 9% Host)
- Unsatisfied: 3% (3% Refugee-like, 6% Host)
- Strongly unsatisfied: 1% (1% Refugee-like, 2% Host)

Refugee-like   Host
Key Findings: Waste Management

➢ 74% of Kotayk’s rural HHs reported using a garbage truck as their primary mechanism for waste disposal.

➢ Across all the regions waste sorting bins are generally not available.

➢ According to waste management service providers, payments by the HHs and business entities as well as service supply to the HHs are the most acute challenges.

➢ Lack of financial resources and old/outdated equipment were the most reported reasons for the existing challenges, the latter was particularly reports in Kotayk.
Waste Management: Host HHs

% of urban and rural host HHs reporting their use of sorting bins prior to COVID-19

- Rural: 91% Yes, 9% No
- Urban: 78% Yes, 22% No

Among host HHs reporting not having used sorting bins prior to COVID-19, the reported reasons were:

- I didn’t want to use the waste sorting bins
- I wanted to use them, but there were none available in my neighborhood
- I wanted to use them, but there were none available in my locality
- I am not in the habit of sorting my waste
- I was not aware where there were waste sorting bins in my locality
- I wanted to use them, but they are not practical for my daily life
- I was not aware of the idea of sorting my waste
Type of waste removal services used by refugee-like HHs in the 30 days prior to data collection

- **Waste removal bins**
  - Kotayk: 59%
  - Syunik: 78%
  - Yerevan: 75%

- **Waste removal pipes**
  - Kotayk: 19%
  - Syunik: 23%

- **Garbage truck**
  - Kotayk: 21%
  - Syunik: 15%
Waste Management: Service Providers

Most commonly reported challenges to waste management, by % of waste management service providers:

- Irregular payments by the HHs: 69% (67% in Yerevan), 57% (53% in Syunik), 44% (41% in Kotayk)
- Service supply to the HHs: 38% (33% in Yerevan), 29% (28% in Syunik), 19% (18% in Kotayk)
- Irregular payments by the business entities: 17% (15% in Yerevan), 14% (14% in Syunik), 14% (13% in Kotayk)
- Service supply to the business entities: 14% (14% in Yerevan), 14% (13% in Syunik), 14% (13% in Kotayk)
- No challenges faced: 6% (6% in Yerevan), 14% (14% in Syunik), 17% (17% in Kotayk)
- Unaware of challenges: 14% (14% in Yerevan), 14% (14% in Syunik), 17% (17% in Kotayk)
Waste Management: Service Providers

According to those service providers who reported challenges with waste disposal service provision (83%), the reasons for these challenges are:

- Lack of financial resources by clients to pay the bills (87% for Kotayk, 80% for Syunik, 50% for Yerevan)
- Old/Outdated equipment (e.g., bins and collection vehicles) (60% for Kotayk, 0% for Syunik, 0% for Yerevan)
- Lack of financial resources to enhance service provisions (47% for Kotayk, 0% for Syunik, 25% for Yerevan)
- Lack of qualified staff (27% for Kotayk, 0% for Syunik, 0% for Yerevan)
- Lack of waste, including hazardous medical waste, management related infrastructure (13% for Kotayk, 25% for Syunik, 0% for Yerevan)
Key Findings: Education

➢ Both urban and rural host community HHs in Syunik commonly reported being **unable to use distance learning tools** due to either a **lack of skills** or a **lack of internet access**

➢ **23%** of refugee-like HHs reported having faced challenges in accessing education upon their arrival to the RA

➢ In Kotayk and Yerevan, refugee-like HHs most commonly reported challenges with **enrollment** as a main education-related related challenged, while in Syunik, the most commonly reported challenge was an **inability to access distance learning equipment**

➢ The main challenges identified by the service providers were the **limited availability of technological equipment**; a **lack of qualified staff**; and **limited quantity of pupils/students attendings educational facilities**
Effect of COVID-19 on Education: Host HHs

Reported effects of COVID-19 on access to education, by % of host HHs reporting their access to education had been affected (25%)

Switch to online education decreased learning

We couldn’t use the distance learning tools because of lack of access to internet or devices

We couldn’t use the distance learning tools because of lack of skills

Yerevan Syunik Urban Syunik Rural Kotayk Urban Kotayk Rural
Effect of NK on Education: Refugee-like HHs

Reported effects of the hostilities in and around NK on access to education, by % of refugee-like HHs reporting their access to education had been affected (23%)

- We couldn’t enroll in education following displacement
- Lack of access to internet
- Lack of equipment for distance learning

0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 40% 45% 50%

Kotayk  Syunik  Yerevan
% of education service providers (n=47) reporting education facilities lack the following resources:

- Computers for pedagogical purposes
- Internet for pedagogical purposes
- Lack of amenities for students with disabilities
- Lack of career training
- Lack of COVID-19 protection items
- Lack of pedagogical resources for staff
- Library
- Nothing
- Supplies

0%  20%  40%  60%  80%

Kotayk  Syunik  Yerevan
% of education service providers (n=47) reporting the following main challenges in the field of education, per region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Kotayk (n=23)</th>
<th>Syunik (n=16)</th>
<th>Yerevan (n=8)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualified staff</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited availability of technological equipment</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited quantity of pupils/students</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No challenges faced</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/teacher ratio</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Healthcare

- During the COVID-19 pandemic, the most used healthcare services by the host HHs were pharmacies for essential drugs, primary care, and basic laboratory services.
- 48% of host HHs reported that the COVID-19 pandemic did not affect their access to healthcare.
- 43% of host HHs reported that the hostilities in and around NK had not affected their access to healthcare.
- 40% of refugee-like HHs reported not accessing healthcare services during the hostilities in and around NK.
- According to medical service providers, healthcare institutions commonly experienced a lack of doctors and medical personnel during the COVID-19 pandemic as well as during the NK hostilities.
- Service providers reported a lack of medical supplies and qualified staff as two key resources lacking in medical facilities.
Healthcare: Host HHs

% of host HH members reporting having used the following medical services prior to COVID-19 (February 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>% of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic laboratory services</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental care</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family doctor</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy for essential drugs</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care system</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Healthcare: Host HHs

Reported effects of COVID-19 on access to healthcare (March-June 2020), by % of host HHs

- Circumstances not affected
- Did not use healthcare services
- Fear of contracting COVID-19
- Borrowed money for medical bills
- Not enough hospital beds
- Could not afford medical support
- Could not access COVID-19 testing/treatment
- No access to ambulance
- Lack of medical personnel
- Corruption
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Reported effects of the hostilities in and around NK on access to healthcare (September-December 2020), by % of host and refugee-like HHs

- Did not use healthcare services
- Circumstances not affected
- Borrowed money for medical bills
- Could not afford medical support
- Not enough hospital beds
- Fear of contracting COVID-19
- Could not access COVID-19 testing/treatment
- Lack of medical personnel
- No access to ambulance
- Corruption

Graph showing the percentage of host and refugee-like HHs affected by various healthcare issues.
% of healthcare service providers (n=37) lacking the following resources in healthcare facilities, per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Kotayk (n=20)</th>
<th>Syunik (n=12)</th>
<th>Yerevan (n=5)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambulances</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of qualified staff</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical supplies</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal protective gear (PPG)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital beds</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical personnel</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Employment

- The majority (89%) of host HHs reported that their employment status had not been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 97% of host HHs reported that the hostilities in and around NK had not affected their employment status.
- 75% of host HHs who engage in agricultural activities did not receive any agricultural support or training.
- Only 13% of refugee-like HHs were employed at the time of data collection, whereas 44% were looking for a job and 43% were unemployed and not looking for work.
- The hostilities in and around NK reportedly affected the employment status of over half of refugee-like HHs (53%), the majority of whom reported having lost their job due to displacement (79%).
Employment: Host HHs

% of host HH survey respondents* reporting employment status at the time of data collection

- 11% Unemployed, not looking for a job
- 38% Employed
- 51% Unemployed, looking for a job

% of host HH survey respondents reporting that COVID-19 affected their employment status

- 11% No
- 89% Yes

*This question was asked to respondents on an individual level
Effect of NK on employment status

% of host and refugee-like HHs reporting that the hostilities in and around NK impacted their main employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugee-like</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Administrative Services

- 98% of host HHs reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had not affected their ability to access administrative services
- 92% of refugee-like HHs reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had not affected their ability to access administrative services
- 27% of service providers reported facing challenges in meeting the demand of administrative services, including the following: lack of mobility for beneficiaries to access services and a lack of institutional guidelines/ frameworks to deal with service provision remotely
% of refugee-like HHs reporting having used administrative services in the 30 days prior to data collection

- None: 44%
- Utility payments: 36%
- Passport services: 17%
- Birth certificates: 12%
- Applications for social benefits: 10%
% of administrative service providers (n=81) reporting COVID-19 has affected their ability to provide administrative services:

- No: 27%
- Yes: 73%

Among those service providers who were reportedly impacted, the most commonly reported impacts of COVID-19 on their ability to provide administrative services:

- Limited mobility of beneficiaries to access services: 77%
- Decreased financial resources: 41%
- Lack of guidelines for remote service provision: 23%
- Lack of distance communication tools: 9%
% of administrative service providers (n=81) reporting that hostilities in and around NK have affected ability to provide administrative services:

- No: 36%
- Yes: 64%

Among those service providers who were reportedly impacted, the most commonly reported impacts of the hostilities in and around NK on their ability to provide administrative services:

- Limited mobility of beneficiaries to access services: 52%
- Inability to meet the higher demand of services due to the influx of displaced populations: 27%
- Decreased financial resources: 24%
- Downsizing of staff/human resources: 6%
Key Findings: Social Services

- **97%** of host HHs reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had not affected their access to social services.

- **97%** of HHs and **94%** of refugee-like HHs reported that the hostilities in and around NK had not affected their access to social services.

- Service providers highlighted two main challenges in delivering social services: the lack of existing technology/infrastructure and the lack of financial resources.
## Social Services: Refugee-like HHs

% of refugee-like HHs reporting having needed the following social services in the 30 days prior to data collection, per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Yerevan</th>
<th>Syunik</th>
<th>Kotayk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assistance</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State benefits</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind and/or cash assistance</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Yerevan**
- **Syunik**
- **Kotayk**
Key Findings: Security and Justice Services

- **98%** of host HHs reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had not affected their ability to access security and justice services.

- **99%** of host HHs and refugee-like HHs reported that the hostilities in and around NK did not affect their access to services.

- According to the majority of service providers, the hostilities in and around NK created challenges due to the **lack of institutional frameworks** and **delays in legal proceedings**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Kotayk</th>
<th>Syunik</th>
<th>Yerevan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic police</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime investigation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation in court</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol police</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of host HHs reporting COVID-19 and the hostilities in and around NK did not impact access to administrative, social, and security services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>COVID-19</th>
<th>NK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Emergency Services

- Both HHs and refugee-like HHs identified the following three risks as threats to their families and livelihoods: natural hazards, COVID-19, and conflict escalation.
- Emergency services providers most commonly identified their top three risks as anthropogenic, natural hazards, and climate change.
- In the past five years prior to data collection, some providers in Yerevan received training in the anthropogenic hazards, natural hazards, and climate change related hazards, whereas most service providers in Kotayk and Syunik reported not having received any training in the 5 years prior to data collection.
% of host HHs reported the following disasters to be a risk for their household and livelihood, per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster Type</th>
<th>Kotayk Rural</th>
<th>Kotayk Urban</th>
<th>Syunik Rural</th>
<th>Syunik Urban</th>
<th>Yerevan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change related hazards</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropogenic hazards</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict escalation</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of refugee-like HHs reporting considering any of the following disasters to be a risk for their household and livelihood, per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kotayk</th>
<th>Syunik</th>
<th>Yerevan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change related hazards</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropogenic Hazards</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict escalation</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazards</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Social Cohesion and Peacebuilding

- The majority of host HHs and refugee-like HHs reported not being interested in engaging in decision-making processes.

- The types of resources that were identified by interviewed service providers to improve community engagement include trainings on civic engagement mechanisms (42%), support to develop or improve upon interactive communication tools (29%); and trainings on conflict resolution and peacebuilding (24%).
Key Findings: Social Cohesion and Peacebuilding

➢ In **Syunik**, 56% of rural HHs and 34% of urban HHs stated that *men participate more than women* in the decision-making process on a community level

➢ In **Kotayk**, 23% of rural HHs and 34% of urban HHs responded that *men participate more than women* in the decision-making process on a community level

➢ An overall 74% of host HHs reported that *women have the same ability as men to make decisions on a household level*

➢ An overall 72% of refugee-like populations noted that *women can equally engage in decision-making on a household level*
Social Cohesion: Community decision-making processes

In your community, do men and women participate equally during decision-making processes?

- Both men and women participate equally
- Men participate more than women
- Women participate more than men
- Don't know
Reported key issues causing tensions in local communities, by % of service providers per region

- **Kotayk**: 56% (There are no social tensions), 22% (Lack of trust), 17% (Competition over socioeconomic opportunities), 6% (Political disputes)
- **Syunik**: 54% (There are no social tensions), 46% (Lack of trust), 46% (Competition over socioeconomic opportunities), 15% (Political disputes)
- **Yerevan**: 43% (There are no social tensions), 29% (Lack of trust), 29% (Competition over socioeconomic opportunities), 14% (Political disputes)
Social Cohesion: Service Providers

Reported mechanisms that resolve tensions in their communities, by % of service providers per region

- One-on-one discussion with community members
- Public meeting/forum
- Phone call
- Online platform
- Voting/participating in electoral processes

Legend:
- Kotayk
- Syunik
- Yerevan

This chart illustrates the percentage of service providers in different regions who reported using various mechanisms to resolve tensions in their communities.
Reported types of resources needed for better community engagement, by % of service providers per region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Yerevan</th>
<th>Syunik</th>
<th>Kotayk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More coordination with provincial authorities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of better community engagement resources</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More coordination with national authorities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to develop/improve interactive communication tools</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender inclusive trainings</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for facilitating electoral processes</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for conflict resolution/peacebuilding</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for efficient public expenditure/budgeting</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for civic engagement mechanisms</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CVA Recommendations

**Employment Opportunities for Conflict-Affected People**
- Livelihoods for refugee-like HHs in view of existing skills and capacities (agriculture)
- Benefits to both hosting and refugee-like populations to avoid exacerbating tensions

**Inclusive Basic Services during the COVID-19 pandemic**
- Access to remote learning including creative technological solutions to bridge digital divide
- Basic healthcare resources and capacity

**Inclusive Governance and Response**
- Capacity building for Local communities and service providers to prepare, protect, and prevent area-specific hazards
- Enhanced existing community engagement mechanisms for both host and refugee-like HHs with a gender lens
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