



With the technical and operational support of:



MONITORING PROGRESS TOWARDS DURABLE SOLUTIONS TO INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

How to Build on the Sub-national Methodology for Greater Pemba, to Scale up Sustainable Monitoring

THE URBAN PROFILING APPROACH – A PILOT FOR SOLUTIONS MONITORING

The urban profiling exercise carried out in Greater Pemba during 2024–2025 aimed at informing institutional policy and planning that support durable solutions to displacement and in particular local integration of IDPs in the urban communities and district structures – be it as interim or as longer-term solutions. The profiling also served as a pilot for monitoring solutions and this Technical Brief describes the methodological approach taken as well as resulting key technical lessons and recommendations. The pilot lessons and reflections presented aim to inform the approach to monitoring solutions at both local and national level.

Comparative analysis to identify obstacles and drivers to solutions:

The methodology was designed as a comparative analysis of the socio-economic situation of the displaced population against that of the non-displaced. By identifying the key differences and commonalities in the situation of displaced and non-displaced, the analysis points to areas where IDPs fare worse and can be assumed to face vulnerabilities related to their displacement situation, while also highlighting shared challenges that point to development-linked problems.¹ By measuring the gap between displaced and

non-displaced persons on key outcomes, evidence is generated to identify where support for IDPs is needed to achieve socio-economic parity with their neighbors. The population analysis was complemented with a spatial analysis that focused on the contextual factors that influence both the livelihoods of the displaced and local populations, as well as the possible displacement solutions for the affected communities and district/municipal structures.

¹ For more background on the durable solutions analysis approach see: UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of IDPs, JIPS, UNHCR, IOM, UNDP, DRC et al. (2018) Durable Solutions Analysis Guide & Indicator Library.

Table 1: Extract of outcome indicators captured in the profiling, indicating alignment with indicators captured by INE in the upcoming IOF survey.

Outcome indicators monitoring progress towards solutions in Pemba, Metuge & Mecufi	IDPs	Non-displaced	Gap to local/ district benchmark
HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY & RESILIENCE			
Households that have zero members with employment (vulnerable)	11%	15%	+4 points
Households that have enough working members (moderate economic dependency ration with more than 1 worker per 4 persons)	78%	72%	-6 points
Households that face severe food insecurity as per the FIES scale	70%	48%	-22 points
Households where at least one person in household has a bank account	26%	40%	+14 points
Households with access to loans and savings associations	16%	27%	+10 points
ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES			
Households with access to basic drinking water services (improved water in a distance less than 30 min or at home) - SDG 6.1.1	68%	90%	+22 points
Households with access to basic sanitation facilities, (improved facility not shared) - SDG 6.2.1	13%	18%	+5 points
Births attended by skilled health personnel within the past 12 months (% of total births taken place within the past 12 months). SDG 3.1.2	89%	90%	1 point
Households who have access to energy (electricity, solar energy or public grid) - SDG 7.1.1	66%	78%	+13 points
Children 5 years and below who do NOT have any birth certificates - SDG 16.9.1	40%	33%	-7 points

Thematic scope & indicator selection:

The socio-economic analysis focused on the following criteria from the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions:² safety, adequate standard of living (incl. access to services, food and housing), access to documentation, livelihoods, housing land and property (HLP), family reunification and participation in public life. The spatial analysis focused on governance, services and infrastructure, HLP, population movement trends, and more. All these topics formed a joined analysis plan that was reviewed by the Profiling Taskforce.³ Subsequently, the identification of indicators per 'solutions criterion' ensured alignment with national socio-economic indicators as well as international standards, such as SDGs and recommendations on IDP statistics and durable solutions analysis.⁴ In the below Table the alignment of indicators with the national survey tool of IOF (2026, ongoing) is demonstrated. Such alignment with national standards has not only ensured quality of analysis but also allowed for comparison with national statistics.

Identification of IDPs:

The household survey captured IDPs and non-displaced persons in the municipality of Pemba as well as the districts of Metuge and Mecúfi.⁵ The categorization of persons into IDPs and non-displaced was done based on a 'criteria based' questionnaire module applied by INE to identify IDPs in national surveys⁶ and currently being rolled out in the Household Budget Survey (IOF 2026). The identification of IDPs was done at the individual level; children born in displacement to IDP parents were categorized as 'IDPs' despite being originally identified by the module as non-displaced (in total 6% of IDPs were found to be born in displacement). *See below, the module used.*

² Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement (2010) IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs, April 2010.

³ The dedicated Taskforce, guiding the profiling, was led by UN-Habitat together with INGD (at national and provincial level) and the Provincial Directorate for Environment and Territorial Planning (DPDTA), which has closely coordinated its activities with the Municipality of Pemba. IOM led on the operational component of data collection. JIPS led on the methodology approach and analysis. INS was invited at provincial and national level to review the profiling approach and accompany the data collection. The elaboration and implementation of the urban profiling was a key-activity under the scope of the Cabo Delgado Solutions Working Group (SWG).

⁴ Expert Group on Refugee, Internally Displaced Persons, and Statelessness Statistics (EGRIS) (2020) International Recommendation on IDP Statistics (IRIS).

⁵ Specifically, IDPs in following geographic strata were included: IDPs and non-displaced in the high-density areas of Pemba center (Pemba Planning Unit 1 and 2); IDPs and non-displaced in the lower-density areas of Pemba periphery (Pemba Planning Unit 2 and 3); IDPs in Metuge and Mecufi living amongst host communities (out of Sites) and the non-displaced households in the same communities; IDPs in Metuge and Mecufi living in the 'permanent Sites'.

⁶ The IDP identification module applied by INE is developed in line with the international recommendations by EGRIS outlined in the Methodological Paper: Towards a standardized approach to identify IDPs, refugees and related populations in household surveys, 2023. The development of the module was done with support by the Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement (JDC) in 2025.

Table 2: IDP identification module for national surveys, INE 2025.

1 Has [NAME] ever lived anywhere else?	a. Yes b. No // SKIP to the end of this module if Q1 = No
2 Has [NAME] ever left their home because they didn't feel safe?	a. Yes b. No // SKIP to the end of this module if Q2 = No and Q3 = No
3 Has [NAME] ever had to flee their home?	a. Yes b. No // SKIP to the end of this module if Q2 = No and Q3 = No
4 Tell me in which district [NAME] was living before leaving because they didn't feel safe or ran away for the first time?	a. PROVINCE & DISTRICT // SKIP to Q6 if Q4 ≠ district of the interview
5 Does [NAME] currently live in the same place they lived before leaving because they didn't feel safe or ran away for the first time?	a. Yes b. No
6 How many times has [NAME] left because they didn't feel safe or had to flee?	NUMBER
7 The last time [NAME] left because they didn't feel safe or had to flee, what year was it?	YEAR
8 The last time [NAME] left because they didn't feel safe or had to flee, what was the main reason?	a. War/armed conflict/attack on the village b. Fear of war/armed conflict/attack on the village c. Natural disaster (flood, drought, cyclone, etc.) d. Other

Possibilities for benchmarking:

As per the comparative analysis approach the displaced population is compared to the non-displaced population in the same geographic area; this provides a local benchmark for the analysis of progress (or of gaps) towards solutions. We also tested using national data as a benchmark: given that Capo Delgado is one of the poorer regions in Mozambique the choice between a local and a national benchmark has large implications on the 'gap' measured (see Table 3).

The IRIS (§140-142)⁷ propose the comparison/ benchmarking to non-displaced at national level using data for the general population, while also noting the usefulness of comparing against the 'host community' for local level decision making. The latter has been done in the present analysis, while ensuring that the comparison to the general population is also feasible across key indicators.

Table 3: Demonstration of different benchmarks to measure the gap to solutions - local vs national.

Outcome indicator contributing to progress towards durable solutions: Households that face severe food insecurity as per the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)		
IDPs in Pemba, Mecúfi and Metuge (in 'sites' and 'out of sites')	70%	
Non-displaced in Pemba, Mecúfi and Metuge (host communities)	48%	
General population - national level	28%	

If local benchmark is used (48%), the % IDPs suffering from severe food insecurity needs to decrease by 28% points

If national benchmark is used (28%), the % IDPs suffering from severe food insecurity needs to decrease by 42% points

⁷ Expert Group on Refugee, Internally Displaced Persons, and Statelessness Statistics (EGRIS) (2020) International Recommendation on IDP Statistics (IRIS).

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE MONITORING OF SOLUTIONS

1

Ensuring sustainability of monitoring through integration into national statistics production:

The recently adopted Action Plan for the PEGDI (the Strategy for the Management of IDPs) has a time span from 2025 to 2029; while reaching durable solutions is typically a lengthy process that will extend beyond this timeframe. Accordingly, it is key that progress towards solutions can be monitored by the Government over many years in a sustainable and cost-effective manner – thus best as an integrated element of the national statistical production. This requires an identification of monitoring indicators that are available in national statistical production and that certain national surveys include the IDP identification module and an IDP sample (like in the IOF 2026). It also requires that resources are added to allow for sampling of IDPs and that capacities are strengthened to allow for the publishing of such national solutions monitoring.

2

Based on the Pemba profiling pilot, relevant outcome indicators can be identified to monitor progress over time:

The profiling study functioned as a pilot of the national framework for solutions monitoring being developed under the SWG with IOMs lead. The profiling tested around 43 outcome indicators, 25–33 of these are also produced in national statistics.⁸ This provides a solid basis for INGD to identify indicators that are most relevant for implementation and monitoring of the ‘Strategy for the Management of IDPs’ (PEGDI). The indicators chosen for solutions monitoring thus need to measure the objectives outlined in PEGDI, which essentially constitute the nationally tailored criteria for solutions in Mozambique. At the same time, the indicators selected also need to be *measurable* through INE national surveys or potentially administrative sources. Such indicator compilation adopted by INGD and operationalised through INE could also serve as a guiding measure for programmatic priorities of the international community supporting the PEGDI implementation.

3

The choice of benchmarking has critical implications for policy:

As demonstrated above (see Table 3), the choice of benchmarking has a great impact on the measured ‘gap’ and thus has significant policy implications. A local (or district) benchmarking showcase where IDPs lag behind their neighbors, pointing to obstacles that IDPs face. A national benchmark points to regional development challenges that go beyond durable solutions policies. A possibility would be a two-stage benchmarking, whereby first target is to reach the local benchmark through the PEGDI policy implementation, and the second target is for IDPs and non-displaced residing in the displacement impacted districts, of e.g. Capo Delgado, to reach the national benchmark (as part of the Governments monitoring of the National Development Plan 2025–2029 and its SDG reporting).⁹

4

Complementing national monitoring with municipality driven monitoring for local planning:

In addition to the regional or national level monitoring, a more local (district or municipal) monitoring of progress towards local integration of the hosted IDPs is key for the authorities. This will support local development planning by considering the additional task it is to accommodate IDPs into the existing structures and ensure social cohesion in the receiving municipalities and districts. The Pemba profiling is exploring integration of key outcome indicators into the Urban Observatory being established jointly by the Municipality of Pemba and UN-Habitat.

5

Complementarity of measuring efforts is key to ensure cost-efficiency and monitoring that is relevant for both national, local and international actors:

Different actors produce data for different purposes and therefore based on different approaches.

⁸ The exact number varies on whether we also count some the indicators that are disaggregated by sex as one or two. This matching exercise would need to be validated jointly with INE.

⁹ Important to also consider are the data sources for the benchmarking: INS is typically publishing statistics at the provincial (Cabo Delgado) and national level. Thus, the benchmarking through INS data can only happen at these two levels, and not at a more local level looking at the hosting communities in particular. The data for IDPs can then either be produced through the same INS national surveys, assuming that an IDP identification module is included (as is the case now in the ongoing IOF survey), or through IDP specific survey by INS or the international community (assuming the tools are fully aligned on the prioritised indicators for the measure).



📷 Representatives from INGD, INE and the Provincial Directorate of Development, Land and Environment review profiling results, Pemba workshop, February 2026.

Monitoring progress of key socio-economic outcome indicators can be made more cost-efficient, rigorous and relevant, if based on an approach that is aligned between government and international actors. Thus, while INE produces statistics mainly at the national and provincial level, humanitarian and development actors produce data mainly at sub-national, area-based level (such as the IOM Solutions Monitoring Index (SMI), the interagency durable solutions profiling or other similar efforts). To avoid duplication of efforts and maximize benefits from several data efforts, it is key that the approach the Government adopts for monitoring solutions, and in particular of the PEGDI, is integrated into the surveys that the international community implements. Thereby, they can contribute to the Government monitoring with a geographically more granular scope, through the IDP focused surveys. Additionally, the Government produces statistics with intervals of few years (e.g. the IOF takes place every 5-6 years), while the humanitarian/development actors produce more regularly data. These different cycles of data production can complement each other and ensure more rich monitoring that not only can measure the PEGDI at provincial or national level but also more locally for area-based interventions.

With the financial support of:



 Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

**Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC**



 **Canada**

ABOUT

The Urban Profiling in Greater Pemba was a collaborative exercise led by UN-Habitat, with operational support by IOM Mozambique and with technical support by the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS). Strategic support has been provided by the United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office (UN RCO), the Solutions Working Group (SWG), the Municipal Council of Pemba and the National Institute for Disaster Management (INGD) at both national and provincial levels, alongside the Provincial Directorate for Environment and Territorial Planning (DPDTA). The National Institute of Statistics (INE) also provided vital technical review and support during the data collection phase.

This profiling exercise was made possible through the generous financial contributions of the Peace Building Fund (PBF), the Internal Displacement Solutions Fund (IDSF), the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), and the High Commissioner of Canada.

Brief preparation:

Margarita Lundkvist-Houndoumadi (JIPS) with critical technical review by Francesco Toressani (UN-Habitat) and Victoria Nyawara (IOM).

Citation:

UN-Habitat, JIPS, IOM (2026). *Technical Brief: Monitoring progress towards durable solutions to internal displacement – how to build on the sub-national methodology for greater Pemba, to scale up sustainable monitoring.*

The analysis from the Profiling can be found in the following publication:

UN Habitat, JIPS, IOM (2026). *Progress Towards Durable Solutions for IDPs in Greater Pemba: Opportunities & Challenges in Pemba, Metuge and Mecúfi.*

Layout & Design: BakOS DESIGN