

Helpdesk Research Report

Democratic Republic of the Congo: Internally displaced persons and refugees' relations with host communities

Brigitte Rohwerder

26.11.2013

Question

What is the relationship between IDPs/refugees and host families and communities in the Eastern DRC and in the area of Uganda along the border with the DRC? – focusing on refugees who stay informally with host communities, rather than the relationship between refugees in the formal refugee camps and the host communities in and around the camps

Contents

1. Overview
2. Choosing hosting as a displacement response
 - 2.1. Reasons IDPs/refugees stay with host families/communities
 - 2.2. Reasons host families/communities accept IDPs/refugees
3. Relationships between IDPs/refugees and host communities
4. Impact of IDPs and refugees over a sustained period
5. References

1. Overview

There are currently around 2,607,407 internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and 152,912 Congolese refugees in Uganda (UNHCR figures, 30/9/13). The majority of these IDPs/refugees are not living in official camps. Instead they have chosen to stay with host families and communities, and in turn these host communities have chosen to accept them.

This report looks at the evidence around: i) why Congolese IDPs/refugees choose to stay with host families and communities rather than in camps and why host families/communities choose to accept

them; ii) the relationship between IDPs/refugees and host communities; and iii) the impact of IDPs/refugees' presence on host communities over a sustained period.

There is a weak evidence base for this topic and it has not been examined in much detail, despite the large numbers of affected people involved. Few articles and reports address it, and most of these are written by NGOs working in the area, with fewer academic sources. Recent literature on the relationship between host communities and both IDPs in eastern DRC and refugees in the border regions of Uganda is scarce (expert comment). This might be due to the difficulties in carrying out research in these areas (expert comment). The majority of the relevant literature is by NGOs carrying out qualitative studies. However, the literature reviewed for this paper is relatively consistent in its findings.

The reasons IDPs/refugees choose to stay with host communities are a combination of factors relating to their physical, emotional and spiritual security, including the following:

- They have a negative perception of the conditions in camps; in Uganda the distance and rigidity of the camp structure is a problem for many.
- They prefer to stay with family and friends, no matter how distant, which leads to a preference for staying with their own ethnic group. This provides them with emotional security and comfort.
- They prefer to stay close to their own fields so they can continue to farm and host families are more practical for this.
- They feel safer in host families.
- They are provided with humanitarian assistance they often don't receive elsewhere.

The reasons host families/communities choose to accept IDPs/refugees is the result of a combination of factors relating to compassion, solidarity and benefits, including:

- They welcome in family and friends and have a broad sense of family.
- They understand what the IDPs/refugees have been through.
- They see a need and meet it.
- They are encouraged to help by their church.
- They receive benefits in the form of the labour of the displaced people and their contributions to the local economy.

The relationship between hosts and IDPs/refugees results from deep social ties and is generally positive. However it can become strained if resources are limited, or if it increases costs for hosts. The main problems are caused by a lack of food and space.

The long term impacts of IDPs/refugees on host communities include: increasing vulnerability, food insecurity, an exhaustion of resources and a weakening of the social support net, as well as negative coping strategies and an increase in insecurity. As a result of not wanting to be a burden on host families, especially in light of the long-term costs, IDPs/refugees have sometimes turned towards camps as a potential long term solution to displacement due the possibility of receiving humanitarian assistance there.

2. Choosing hosting as a displacement response

In situations of forced displacement, IDPs and refugees can choose between official camps, 'spontaneous settlements' which are unofficial camps set up by IDPs in communities, and more personal host relationships. These host relationships include: staying with family, friends, random (host initiated, displaced initiated, church initiated) and rented accommodation (McDowell, 2008).

IDPs from the DRC have been found to overwhelmingly favour hosting as a displacement response (Briggs and Hersh, 2013; McDowell, 2008; Haver, 2008). According to a study carried out by Refugees International in March 2013, those living in official camps only make up one ninth of the refugee population. The remainder live in 'spontaneous settlements' or with host families (Briggs and Hersh, 2013, p.1). The situation was similar in 2008, when UNICEF and CARE carried out a study in North Kivu which found that the vast majority (65 per cent) of displaced stayed with host families (McDowell, 2008, p.5). Approximately two-thirds of those staying in camps stayed in spontaneous camps which McDowell suggests could be considered as a form of communal hosting due to their reliance on a host community (ibid p.5). The Ugandan Red Cross found that after an influx of IDPs in Bundibugyo District in July 2013, close to 20,000 refugees had integrated into local communities, only 7,000 less than those registered at the Bubukwanga Transit Camp (Ugandan Red Cross expert comment).

Host families and communities are normally the **first response to people facing displacement**. A 2008 Oxfam report found that newly displaced people will usually find shelter, food and water with the first community where they spend the night, and often for many nights afterwards (Haver, 2008, p.12). Due to the cycles of violence and displacement in Eastern Congo, host families often host IDPs around three to four times, for around three months (Simpson, 2010, p.36). The border region of Uganda has seen similar cycles of displacement from across the DRC border (expert comment).

Despite large numbers of IDPs/refugees choosing hosting as their displacement option, much less is known about them and their decision making processes (expert comment; Hovil, 2007, p.601). The most recent in-depth examination of the relationship between IDPs/refugees and hosts was in 2008 in DRC (McDowell, 2008) and 2007 in Uganda (Hovil, 2007). What is known is explored below.

2.1 Reasons IDPs/refugees stay with host families/communities

The primary attraction of hosting and the reason IDPs/refugees choose it appears to be the physical, emotional, and spiritual security it provides the displaced and the esteem it confers on the host. These factors to host or be hosted constituted more than 90 per cent of the responses in the UNICEF/CARE study (McDowell, 2008, p.7).

DRC

Within the DRC a number of different factors lead to IDPs choosing to stay with host families. The overarching reason outlined in the 2008 Oxfam study in North Kivu was that IDPs preferred host families because they were seen to be more '**physically, emotionally and spiritually**' secure (Haver, 2008, p.5). This is combined with a 'negative perception of camps' which enhances the positive perception of the security provided by host families (Haver, 2008, p. 24).

One of the most important factors in choosing location is the presence of a friend or family member, however distantly related. As the concept of family is very broad this means a whole village might be considered kin (expert comment). Studies in North Kivu are consistent in finding that around 80 per cent

of hosts and IDPs either knew one another previously or had a family connection (Haver, 2008, p.24). Interviewees in the UNICEF/CARE study reported travelling for many days, passing many potential places of refuge, to be with family or friends (McDowell, 2008, p.14).

For some IDPs, being near one's own ethnic group offers a sense of emotional or physical security (Haver, 2008, p.24). The UNICEF/CARE study found that **ethnicity is an important factor** in choosing a place of refuge, whether with a host or in a camp. In town of Minova the displaced Hunde and Hutu population reported that they chose to form a camp in order to be together, rather than seek refuge with the Bahavu host community (McDowell, 2008, p.6). McDowell suggests that this is because ethnicity is seen as an extension of family and there are emotional and spiritual notions of security (ibid, p.14). IDPs would reportedly go to where they knew they had family or at least members of the same ethnic group, not because there were problems amongst the ethnic groups but because they want to be near family during a time of stress and to avoid potentially uncomfortable situations or discrimination (McDowell, 2008, p.14-15).

While family or ethnic links are an important consideration, it is important to note that one-fifth of IDPs surveyed for the UNICEF/CARE study were **staying with previously unknown persons**. They met by literally knocking on doors, being introduced through a church, or through the host family themselves offering them refuge. Approximately one-third of such hosting relationships between strangers were between people not from the same ethnic group (McDowell, 2008, p.6).

Many IDPs try to stay **as close as possible to their homes and farms** so they can continue to work the land, gather food, and reassert ownership over their property if the situation improves (Simpson, 2010, p. 5). This means they prefer to stay with host families close to their villages as it is a more practical option (expert comment). Lack of assistance in previous displacements also leads them to pursue this risky strategy (Simpson, 2010, p. 34-35).

A Human Rights Watch report found that even though host families are themselves often improvised after years of conflict IDPs feel more **physically and emotionally protected** with host families than in sites or camps (Simpson, 2010, p.36). Perhaps this is because it reminds them of home (expert comment).

Host families provide IDPs with vital assistance in an environment where official humanitarian aid is hard to access. The Human Rights Watch report found that in 2009 local authorities in towns of Masisi and Lushebere said that many IDPs had first sought refuge in the camps and had only opted for host families when they found no space or assistance there (Simpson, 2010, p.39).

Despite the overall preference for staying with hosts, the long-term nature of the displacement meant that in 2008 there was a shift towards camps, not as a rejection of hosting, but due to the benefits of camps as compared to a long term hosting arrangement (McDowell, 2008, p.10). The UNICEF/CARE study found increasing threats, in more places, meant that more people were displaced and for longer periods. Respondents to the study indicated that the changes in duration of displacement affected the decisions made to seek refuge in a camp or host family as the host families resources ran low (McDowell, 2008, p.10).

The tables below examine the reasons participants in the 2008 UNICEF/CARE study gave for choosing either a hosting relationship or to enter a camp.

Table 1: Primary criteria used by IDPs entering into a hosting relationship (per cent of responses from individual interviews)

| Criterion | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Negative perspective of camps | 33 per cent |
| Desire to be with family | 18 per cent |
| Work/farming opportunities | 17 per cent |
| Security (physical) | 13 per cent |
| No camps accessible | 10 per cent |
| Close to home | 5 per cent |
| Other | 4 per cent |

Source: McDowell, 2008, p.13.

Table 2: Decision making criteria used by persons entering camps (per cent of responses from individual interviews)

| Criterion | Formal camps | Spontaneous Camps |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| No family/friends | 36 per cent | 35 per cent |
| Expectations of aid | 28 per cent | 9 per cent |
| Security | 21 per cent | 20 per cent |
| Avoid burdening host | 15 per cent | * |
| Prefer spontaneous to formal camp | | 13 per cent |
| First opportunity | | 7 per cent |
| Rural work/farming opportunities | | 16 per cent |

*Despite not indicating so during their interviews, discussions in spontaneous camps showed respondents were also concerned about burdening hosts

Source: McDowell, 2008, p.13.

Uganda

A 2003 report by the Refugee Law Project found that Congolese refugees were choosing to stay with host families because some of them had **relatives in the area**, some could better manage their livelihoods in the border areas than if they went to camps and some wanted to be able to return home easily (Hovil, 2003, p.10). Similar reasons persist today (expert comments).

The presence of contacts among the host population, whether directly (through family affiliation, for instance) or more indirectly, or through wider ethnic affiliation and a common history of displacement, means refugees have the option of staying with host communities rather than in camps (Hovil 2007, p. 613; Ugandan Red Cross expert comment).

This is a preferable option for most refugees as they don't like the close quarters of camp and risk of disease (Hovil 2007, p.612). Hovil's interviews also suggest that the freedom outside of camps appealed to refugees who choose to self-settle, especially in relation to being able to work (2007, p.607). Many self-settled refugees were not only supporting themselves but were engaged in the local economy (2007, p.609). Some interviews in the border region described returning to DRC once or twice a week in order to farm their land (2007, p.611). It makes logistical sense for them to stay near the border (expert comments) and is a creative approach to balancing security and livelihoods (expert comment).

The refugees are unlikely to live for long in host households but negotiate land to settle on (expert comment) or they are able to rent houses themselves which they find preferable to the conditions in camps (Ugandan Red Cross expert comment).

2.2 Reasons host families/communities accept IDPs/refugees

DRC

Estimates by the UNICEF/CARE study suggest that in 2008 with the exception of the city of Goma, 60-80 per cent of families in host communities were hosting IDPs (McDowell, 2008, p.6). An unpublished study carried out by Oxfam in 2008 found that despite the difficulties involved in hosting, the host families consulted expressed a strong commitment to the act. In the words of one person, 'Host and IDP, we are in the same boat.' Another explained, 'Love made us do it' and, 'it could be us tomorrow' (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9).

According to the UNICEF/CARE study, 80 per cent of IDPs were hosted by family or friends (McDowell, 2008, p.7). Where this is not the case, people took in strangers motivated by a sense of solidarity and because they couldn't tolerate the sight of suffering (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9). Sometimes, at the encouragement of their church leaders, church members agreed to host members of the same faith that arrived in their community (McDowell, 2008, p.18; expert comment). 90 per cent of hosts indicated that they chose to host equally due to a sense of family or compassion (ibid, p.22). A study carried out by a church group found that host families were taking in IDPs because they saw a need and responded (RIM, no date, p.5). One expert suggested that there may be a sense of shame if you let your family members go to a camp (expert comment).

According to the UNICEF/CARE study insecurity is commonly monitored in North Kivu and families will often anticipate the arrival of displaced family members in advance. Respondent hosts said that it is an honour to have a family or friend choose your home as refuge (McDowell, 2008, p.17).

Despite compassion seeming to be the main motivator for hosting IDPs, the 2008 Oxfam study suggests that examples of unpaid labour, alongside cases of women being coerced into sexual relations with their hosts, point to these relationship perhaps not being purely altruistic (Haver, 2008, p.24). A Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) analysis also suggests that there might also be an element of exploitation on the part of hosts (McDowell, 2008, p.21).

The people questioned in the UNICEF/CARE study overwhelmingly reported that hosting had been a positive experience despite its problems. 80 per cent of hosts said they would do it again and 60 per cent reported a positive bond with their displaced guests. Impediments to prolonged hosting are grounded in the capacity to host. 60 per cent of the difficulties reported by current hosts related to inadequate food, illness (due to deterioration in hygiene associated with crowded conditions) and space in their home (McDowell, 2008, p.6).

Uganda

The people living in the border regions of Uganda share a similar language and culture and cross-border markets to the refugees from the DRC and therefore reportedly feel an affiliation with and are often related to them (Hovil 2007, p.614). The Ugandan Red Cross found that many community members actively encouraged refugees to remain in the local community by inviting their relatives to come 'home' (Ugandan Red Cross expert comment).

A 2003 report by the Refugee Law Project found that some locals were benefitting economically from the presence of refugees so were happy to have them in the area as these refugees had arrived with money and/or commodities (Hovil, 2003, p.11-12). In addition, local communities were sympathetic and inclined to help the refugees (ibid). This continues to be the case today with the perception in some areas that the community stands to benefit if it hosts several thousands of refugees within its area, formally or otherwise (Ugandan Red Cross expert comment).

3. Relationships between IDPs/refugees and host communities

The 2008 unpublished Oxfam study found that the hosting relationships centre around sharing shelter, food and meals together (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9). The relationships between IDPs/refugees and host families and communities vary widely – and can be based on informal or more formal agreements. For example, some involve informal provision to family or friends of shelter and food (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9). Other types of hosting relationships can involve rental agreements. And others – for example spontaneous camps – require small levels of negotiations or informal arrangements (McDowell, 2008, p.7). These relationships between hosts and IDPs/refugees can become more complicated over time.

The literature highlights that certain individuals are less likely to be accepted by hosts, or face greater vulnerability when residing with them. An unpublished Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) study from 2013 found that people with disabilities, especially older people with disabilities were often left behind when people flee (2013, p.8). An expert working for Refugees International with IDPs in Eastern DRC suggested that the relationship between hosts and vulnerable populations was an area that needed to be looked into in more detail. They suggested that there can be a lack of understanding of the needs of more vulnerable or disadvantaged adults and children and how these needs can be met by the limited capacity of hosts.

The literature indicates that relationships between IDPs/refugees and host communities are affected by four types of factors: households' physical and emotional capacity to host IDPs/refugees; IDPs/refugee contributions to host households; IDPs/refugees' impact on the community; and external factors.

Capacity to host

Relationships between IDPs/refugees are influenced by host households' capacity to host. This is dependent on their physical and emotional resources, and how long they last.

Physical resources

The UNICEF/CARE study found that the costs of hosting are substantial, with costs for the displacement transferred from hosted IDPs to host family. A host family will feed its guest from food stores or from their fields which is not adequate to cater for the growth in household size. Consistently, hosts and displaced have to reduce the number of meals and the quantity of food. The consumption of surplus also means that a host must forgo future opportunities (savings to meet medical, education costs, clothing etc.) which were previously met through sales of surplus produce. Latrine facilities are often inadequate for two families and poor hygiene is a concern. Privacy is also lost due to the lack of space (McDowell, 2008, p.8). The unpublished 2008 Oxfam study found that the lack of space and resources negatively affected relationships as tensions quickly arose over small things (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9; see also Simpson, 2010, p.37).

A rough estimate by the UNICEF/CARE study suggested that in 2008 the financial cost of hosting, carried by host families in North Kivu was approximately 1 to 2 million US dollars per month (McDowell, 2008, p.8). However, because of the burdens of hosting, host families often become just as economically vulnerable as their IDP guests (Simpson, 2010, p.38). The most common coping mechanism to immediate household issues was 'to endure' (known as '*kuvumilia*') (McDowell, 2008, p.8).

According to the UNICEF/CARE study, if the physical resources are there so that issues of both food and space can be resolved, long-term hosting can move from a positive but difficult experience to a successful one (McDowell, 2008). Several successful cases were between older hosts who had excess space in their homes and food capacity in their farms. These successful relationships were recorded across different ethnic, religious and age groups (McDowell, 2008, p.7).

Emotional resources

McDowell attributed the success of hosting he observed in 2008 to the deep social ties which bind these communities. The compassion and empathy would also seem to explain the peaceful cohabitation of different ethnic groups during an ethnically charged crisis (McDowell, 2008, p.31). McDowell also suggests that the strong emotional bond involved in hosting is illustrated by the ease in which such arrangements are made (McDowell, 2008, p.7).

According to the UNICEF/CARE study the perceived cost of hosting reported by hosts and displaced fell into two categories *shida* (problems) and *ugomvi* (frustrations). In the short term hosts have the resources to respond to needs but over time they become urgent issues for both hosts and IDPs (McDowell, 2008, p.19). Lack of food or demands for rent, combined with frustrations is often at the root of the break-up of hosting relationships (McDowell, 2008, p.6). In all cases in the UNICEF/CARE study there was also a desire to remove the burden the displaced had placed on their host (McDowell, 2008, p.22).

IDPs/refugees' contributions

The pressure on host resources can be eased by IDP/refugee contributions. The 2008 Oxfam study found that displaced people are expected to contribute to host households in whatever ways they can, e.g. working in fields, collecting wood and sharing humanitarian assistance (Haver, 2008, p.24). They also take advantage of the income generating opportunities that exist in the host community (McDowell, 2008, p.5). In most cases, however, IDPs acknowledge that they had virtually nothing to contribute, which is a source of frustration for them (Haver, 2008, p.24).

The unpublished 2008 Oxfam study found that host families sometimes acknowledged that IDPs occasionally 'contributed' as their presence led to communities receiving assistance in the form of community services (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.9). However, McDowell, found that this acknowledgement happened infrequently (2008, p. 37).

Appropriate and adequate income opportunities for hosted IDPs so that they can contribute to the relationship is an important factor in the success of a hosting relationship. This led to a preference for rural areas where they can continue farming (McDowell, 2008, p.23).

IDPs/refugees impact on the community

One expert contacted for this report suggests that relationship between IDPs and host communities depends on the individual communities and their ability to cope (expert comment). The community

needs to have the resources to deal with the demand the high number of displaced in homes places on its services, employment opportunities and food stocks. The situation has both positive and negative consequences for a community (McDowell, 2008, p.18).

Beytrison and Kalis's recent article (2013, p.22) states that some community leaders in eastern DRC have expressed concern over the presence of IDPs, claiming that they were responsible for food insecurity and even for bringing instability and weapons into the community. UNICEF/CARE's study suggests that IDPs could also bring benefits to the community through their labour. This additional labour meant that communities were able to cultivate more land, more intensively, giving better yields (McDowell, 2008, p.32).

In Uganda, research shows that on the whole, the host communities showed considerable willingness to allow refugees to live in the area. However, the sustainability and success of this was largely contingent upon the refugees being seen as a net economic benefit to the area. This was particularly important given the extra stress on resources such as health clinics and schools (Hovil 2007, p. 111).

The 2003 report by the Refugee Law Project found that this increasing demand on resources eroded the willingness of local communities to host refugees, with life becoming progressively difficult for refugees and host communities alike (Hovil, 2003, p.15).

External factors

A number of external factors also impact on the relationship between IDPs and host communities. Human Rights Watch found that numerous IDPs living with host families said they lost belongings to armed groups specifically targeting their hosts' homes (Simpson, 2010, p.46). This exacerbated the sometimes strained relationship between the two (ibid, p.45).

In addition, the discrepancy between what is provided by the international community in camps and what is provided by the government in terms of local services leaves local populations feeling disadvantaged (Ryan and Keyzer, 2013, p.26; see also McDowell, 2008, p.37).

4. Impact of IDPs and refugees over a sustained period

The UNICEF/CARE study found that from their interviews and reports from UNHCR, problems with hosting seem to emerge after one to three months, although the hosting period still was a median of six months (McDowell, 2008, p.7). After three months, the capacity to host is exhausted and both the hosts and displaced struggle to survive (ibid, p.19). As the period of hosting becomes sustained its impact changes. The UNICEF/CARE study found that as the conflict continues the costs of hosting undermine the social cohesion which is the foundation of hosting (McDowell, 2008, p.19).

Capacity to cope over time

In the opinion of host communities surveyed for the UNICEF/CARE study, the net impact of displacement on a hosting community, whether in host families or camps and despite being a positive experience, was negative (McDowell, p.34). The social safety nets are unable to continue carrying the burden for such a large number of long-term displaced (McDowell, 2008, p.31). The vulnerability of host communities increases, with problems such as the demand for fire-wood doubling or tripling with the resulting deforestation of the neighbouring environment (RIM, no date, p.5). The communities and IDPs develop a combination of coping strategies in response to the challenges they face.

Positive coping methods

Communities can cope positively by changing the nature of their farming by using the additional labour to become more productive and therefore ease the food resource situation (McDowell, 2008, p.32). Casual labour and small scale business gives sense of purpose and help IDPs to contribute (ibid). An expert suggested that communities can also learn from each other and friendships between host and IDP/refugee communities can be reinforced.

Negative coping methods

However, the UNICEF/CARE report found that the psychological impact of daily frustrations, hunger and lack of employment for IDPs can sometimes lead to negative coping mechanisms such as theft from neighbouring farms, drinking and smoking marijuana. Increases in insecurity and rape were consistently reported in all locations (McDowell, 2008, p.8). The rise of these negative coping strategies is proportionate to the inability of positive coping mechanisms to overcome the long-term challenges within a hosting relationship or a camp (ibid, p.33).

The UNICEF/CARE study also reported that over time there was also a change in behaviour and social mores of the displaced. Such changes were attributed to the increasing burden of daily subsistence and psychological impacts of long-term displacement. A regularly reported negative coping strategy among young women was prostitution (McDowell, 2008, p.34). Such changes were reported to be more pronounced in camps than in hosting relationships (McDowell, 2008, p.35).

Depleting resources

Long-term hosting leads to a depletion of resources. The unpublished 2008 Oxfam report found that people were eating only one meal, instead of two as a result of hosting, with women eating less than men (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.11). 53 per cent of hosts also cited difficulty in accessing services after hosting, although a certain percentage of these people had only experienced more minor limitations on services, such as having to wait longer in line to collect water due to the influx of people (unpublished Haver, 2008, p.13). There was a decrease in hygiene and an increase in illness (McDowell, 2008, p.35). After a while, hosted IDPs might have to start paying rent and providing their own food as a result of the hardships of long term hosting despite this going against the custom of providing for guests (McDowell, 2008, p.18).

Moving to camps

Longer term displacement has put pressure on the resources of host families and has led to more IDPs going to spontaneous sites and camps where, access permitting, aid agencies were able to provide some assistance (Simpson, 2010, p.20). Recent years have also seen an increasing number of people choosing camps over hosts because of a lack of safe places to flee as insecurity becomes more widespread (Beytrison and Kalis, 2013, p.22) and communities are unable to cope with the increased numbers of people (IDMC, 2011, p.4). The 2008 Oxfam report also found that the growing population in camps has been mainly the result of increasing 'saturation' of communities with IDPs and the longer periods of displacement, as well as the aid directed to these camps and not to host families (Haver, 2008, p.5). The IDPs surveyed for the Oxfam report in North Kivu expressed that they did not want to be a burden on host families (Haver, 2008, p.17).

The 2008 UNICEF/CARE study also found that IDPs were moving into camps because they are sensitive to the impacts of long-term hosting for the host and for themselves (McDowell, 2008, p.5). Opting to live in a camp is in part a decision to avoid material difficulties within long-term hosting relationships and a

recognition of the limited capacity of hosts to host over the long term, rather than an overt desire to live in a camp (McDowell, 2008, p.5, p.39). However despite reaching 35 per cent in informal camps in 2008, by 2011 this had dropped to 17 per cent, with the remainder still staying with host families or sleeping rough in the forest (IDMC, 2011, p.5).

The 2010 Human Rights Watch Report found that for many IDPs the scale and longevity of displacement means they have nowhere else to go and therefore local integration into their host community is their only option (Simpson, 2010, p.63).

5. References

- Beytrison, F. & Kalis, O. (2013). Repeated displacement in eastern DRC. *Forced Migration Review*, Issue 43, 22-23. Retrieved from: <http://www.fmreview.org/en/fmr43full.pdf>
- Briggs, C. & Hersh, M. (2013). *DR CONGO: Outdated Approach, Misplaced Priorities*. Refugees International. Retrieved from: http://refugeesinternational.org/sites/default/files/032613_DR_Congo_Outdatedpercent20letterhead.pdf
- Haver, K. (2008). *Out of Site: Building better responses to displacement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo by helping host families*. Oxfam GB. Retrieved from: <http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/out-of-site-drc-0908.pdf>
- Haver, K. (2008). *Study on food security, livelihoods and relations among host families and IDPs in Sud Lubero, Nord Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo – Draft for Consultation*. Unpublished report, Oxfam GB.
- Hovil, L. (2003). *Displacement in Bundibugyo District: A Situation Analysis*. Refugee Law Project Working Paper No. 10. Retrieved from: http://www.refugeelawproject.org/working_papers/RLP.WP10.pdf
- Hovil, L. (2007). Self-settled Refugees in Uganda: An Alternative Approach to Displacement? *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol.20, Issue 4, 599-620. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem035>
- IDMC (2011). *Democratic Republic of Congo: IDPs need further assistance in context of continued attacks and insecurity*. IDMC & NRC. Retrieved from: [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/111D01A00B251BE0C125790B002DFC4C/\\$file/DRC-Overview-Sept2011.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/111D01A00B251BE0C125790B002DFC4C/$file/DRC-Overview-Sept2011.pdf)
- McDowell, S. (2008). *Internal Displacement in North Kivu: Hosting, Camps, and Coping Mechanisms*. UNICEF DRC and CARE DRC. Retrieved from: [http://www.nrc.ch/8025708F004CE90B/\(httpDocuments\)/AAAB29100043CC15C12574CC0071F90B/\\$file/Internal+Displacement+in+North+Kivu-Hosting+Camps+and+Coping+_2_.pdf](http://www.nrc.ch/8025708F004CE90B/(httpDocuments)/AAAB29100043CC15C12574CC0071F90B/$file/Internal+Displacement+in+North+Kivu-Hosting+Camps+and+Coping+_2_.pdf)
- Refugee and Immigration Ministries (RIM) (no date). *Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) Refugees and Internally Displaced*. RIM. Retrieved from: <http://www.discipleshomemissions.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/RIMCongo.pdf>
- Ryan, L. & Keyzer, D. (2013). 'Everyone for themselves' in DRC's North Kivu. *Forced Migration Review*, Issue 43, 24-27. Retrieved from: <http://www.fmreview.org/en/fmr43full.pdf>

Simpson, G. (2010). *Always on the Run: The Vicious Cycle of Displacement in Eastern Congo*. Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from:
<http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/drc0910webwcover.pdf>

Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) (2013). *Internal notes from Novo research North Kivu, DRC (and Some South Kivu) February 2013*. Unpublished report, WRC.

Expert contributors

Caelin Briggs, Refugees International
Dale Buscher, Women's Refugee Commission
Elizabeth Ferris, Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement
Katherine Haver, Humanitarian Outcomes
Lucy Hovil, International Refugee Rights Initiative
Ellie Kemp, ex- Oxfam
Alexandra Krause, UNHCR
Katie McQuaid, University of Sussex
Gloria Nguya, Wageningen UR
Catherine Ntabadde-Makumbi, Ugandan Red Cross
Masika Prosperine, University Catholique du Graben, Butembo

About this report

This report is based on four days of desk-based research. It was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development, © DFID Crown Copyright 2013. This report is licensed under the Open Government Licence (www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence). The views expressed in this report are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of GSDRC, its partner agencies or DFID.

The GSDRC Research Helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of key literature and of expert thinking in response to specific questions on governance, social development, humanitarian and conflict issues. Its concise reports draw on a selection of the best recent literature available and on input from international experts. Each GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report is peer-reviewed by a member of the GSDRC team. Search over 400 reports at www.gsdr.org/go/research-helpdesk. Contact: helpdesk@gsdr.org.

Suggested citation

Rohwerder, B. (2013). *Democratic Republic of the Congo: Internally displaced persons and refugees' relations with host communities* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 1032). Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.