Following an outbreak of violence on 25 August 2017 in Rakhine State, Myanmar, a new massive influx of Rohingya refugees to Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh started in late August 2017. Most of the Rohingya refugees settled in Ukhia and Teknaf Upazilas of Cox’s Bazar, a district bordering Myanmar identified as the main entry areas for border crossings.

Previous inflows were recorded in October 2016, when approximately 87,000 crossed into Bangladesh, and other waves were registered during the previous decades. The number of Rohingya refugees, both registered and unregistered, residing in Cox’s Bazar prior to August 2017 is estimated to be around 213,000 individuals.

(* Between 15 December 2017 and 30 January 2018, no dramatic inflows were recorded. However, the improved methodology and wider coverage of NPM Site Assessment allowed to assess a higher number of locations and to gather more precise information. The increase between NPM SA 7 and NPM SA 8 should be attributed minimally to new arrivals, and largely to the refined methodology.)
POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND SETTLEMENT TYPE

The NPM Site Assessment (SA) collects information about the overall Rohingya population, including refugees who arrived before 25 August 2017. It does not collect information on the entire Rohingya population in Bangladesh, but in Cox’s Bazar district only. The NPA SA covers all sites where Rohingya refugees have been identified irrespective of the location type, including makeshifts settlements, spontaneous settlements, host communities, and formal refugee camps. Information is collected through interviews with Key Informants (KIs), particularly majhees (community leaders in camp-like settings).

Between 15 and 30 January 2018, an estimated 884,000 individuals (approximately 205,500 households) were identified in 1,658 locations. Of these, 82% were living in new spontaneous settlements, 1% in makeshift settlements, 12% were living in host community locations and 4% in the formal refugee camps. Of the total population, 33,538 were registered refugees (UNHCR, January 2018), who live in the only two formal refugee camps (Kutupalong and Nayapara refugee camps). The remaining 850,000 were unregistered refugees who live in all locations including the formal refugee camps. In this analysis, locations in Makeshift, Spontaneous Settlements and Formal Refugee camps will be referred to as camp-like settings.

The Refugee Relief and Repatriation Commissioner (RRRC), supported by UNHCR, conducted a family counting (FC) exercise in the collective sites, and the results were compared with the population estimates gathered by NPM. In the majority of cases, the two figures were closely aligned. Where discrepancies existed, these were generally attributed to boundary issues or movements between the dates of the two assessment exercises, as well as to the different methodologies used by each exercise.

Table 1: Distribution of individuals and households by type of settlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of settlement</th>
<th>Host communities</th>
<th>Makeshift settlements</th>
<th>New spontaneous sites</th>
<th>Refugee camps</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total locations assessed</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>24027</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>171404</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>205479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total individuals</td>
<td>110223</td>
<td>9318</td>
<td>725827</td>
<td>38417</td>
<td>883785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the Rohingya refugees live in Ukhia upazila, comprising 82% of the total households and 80% of the total identified individuals. The second largest group lives in Teknaf, comprising over 17% of households and nearly 19% of individuals.

Table 2: Distribution of individuals and households by Upazila of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upazila</th>
<th>Cox’s Bazar Sadar</th>
<th>Ramu</th>
<th>Teknaf</th>
<th>Ukhia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>35894</td>
<td>167855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>6164</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>166225</td>
<td>709773</td>
<td>883785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocks in camp-like settings or villages/communities in out-of-camp settings.

This term used to describe spontaneous settlements established pre-October 2017, including Kutupalong MS, Balukhali MS and Leda MS. To better reflect the current context, ISCG now defines as spontaneous settlements both Kutupalong MS and Balukhali MS, since no clear distinction exists between these two sites and the spontaneous settlement developed around them, referred to as Kutupalong-Balukhali Expansion Site.

SEX AND AGE DISAGGREGATED DATA AND VULNERABILITIES

To coordinate better with the Family Counting Exercise, NPM did not collect demographic data during Round 8. While vulnerability data is collected, it is more accurate at a household level, and therefore NPM recommends using the demographic and vulnerability data collected by the Family Counting exercise, as follows:

Table 3: Population disaggregation by sex and age (RRRC/UNHCR 30 January 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/Age</th>
<th>Under 1</th>
<th>1 to 4</th>
<th>5 to 11</th>
<th>12 to 17</th>
<th>18 to 59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Percentage of families with vulnerabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Single mothers</th>
<th>Serious medical condition</th>
<th>Older person at risk</th>
<th>Disabled person</th>
<th>Separated children</th>
<th>Older person at risk with children</th>
<th>Single father</th>
<th>Unaccompanied child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.35%</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MULTI-SECTORAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FINDINGS

SITE MANAGEMENT

Access: 82% of the assessed locations were accessible only by footpath, creating an extremely challenging situation for the delivery of humanitarian aid. Of these, 73% were in camp like settings and 9% in host communities.

Of the remaining, 12% were accessible by small vehicle, 8% in camp-like settings and 4% in host communities, and 7% by large vehicles, 5% in camp-like settings and 2% in host communities.

Ownership of Land/Location: 90% of the assessed locations were on public or government land, while 10% were reported to be on private land. Most of the settlement sites on private land were locations in host communities.

Secondary displacement: In 5% of assessed locations, key informants (KIs) indicated that at least some of their community was settled somewhere else, prior to arriving to their current location. Similarly, in 12% of locations KIs reported secondary displacement either within the same site but to another block (5%), or to another site (6%). The remaining (1%) reported a population movement but could not indicate the destination.

SHELTER

Assistance received: in 95% of locations it was reported that the population received shelter assistance to date. This proportion was lower in the host community locations, representing almost the whole remaining 5% of locations where KIs reported not having received any shelter or NFI assistance.

Graph 1: percentage of locations by settlement type where key shelter and non-food items (NFI) were distributed.
Source of assistance: reportedly, in 93% of locations population received shelter and NFI assistance from UN/INGOs, in 69% from the military, in 19% from local organizations, in 13% from government authorities.

Need gaps: in 87% of locations, KIs indicated fuel among the top three most urgent needs, followed by 61% indicating cooking items, and 42% the provision of shelter materials.
Safety concerns: in 62% of locations it is reported that inadequate lighting was the primary shelter-related safety concern, while in 24% unstable shelter structure was reported as a key concern.

Graph 4: percentage of locations by settlement type and primary safety concern.

WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

Water sources: in 90% of all locations it was reported that tube wells/handpump were the most common source of water for household use. Of these, 79% were in camp-like settings and 11% in host communities.

Water needs: only in 7 locations it was reported that the refugee population had no access at all to water, of these 6 were in camp-like settings. In approximately 9% of all locations it was reported that access to water was limited, as only some people had enough water for their needs. In 38% of assessed locations at least half of the population had enough water, while in 40% most people had enough and in 13% nearly everyone had enough water for their needs.

Graph 5: percentages of locations by settlement and level of access to water.
**Access to bathing facilities:** in 2% of all locations it was reported that almost nobody had access to bathing facilities, while in 15% of locations that only some people did. In 36% of locations, KIs reported that at least half of the population had access to bathing facilities, in 33% most people and 14% nearly everybody was reported having access to bathing facilities.

Graph 6: percentages of locations by settlement type and access to bathing facilities.

**Access to latrines:** only in 1% of all locations it was reported that almost nobody had access to latrines, while in 14% of locations only some people did. In 35% of locations, KIs reported that at least half of the population had access to latrines, in 36% most people and 14% nearly everybody.

Graph 7: percentages of locations by settlement type and access to latrines.

**Safety and security:** in 95% of assessed locations, KIs reported that latrines had no adequate lightening, and in 90% that latrines had no locks. This has an impact on refugees’ actual and perceived safety and security. Latrines were reported to be a place of security incidents for children in 89% of locations, and for women in 69%. Lack of privacy (no locks or door) was reported among the problems preventing access to latrines in 10% of locations. Latrines were reportedly not sex-segregated in 90% of locations, and this was reported to be an obstacle impeding access to latrines in 65% of assessed locations.
HEALTH

Access to health facilities: Only in 1% of locations KIs reported not to have access to health facilities. However, in 16% locations it was responded that the population had to travel over 30 minutes to reach the nearest health facility on foot.

Health service: KIs were asked whether people in their location faced problems accessing various services. In 23% of locations, it was reported that refugees faced problems accessing antenatal care, either because the service was not available, or because it was available but not easily accessible. Likewise, in 81% of locations KIs reported problems accessing psychosocial support, and in 70% accessing rehabilitation services.

FOOD SECURITY, NUTRITION AND LIVELIHOODS

Source of food: the most common source of food was UN/INGO food distributions, reported in 95% of all assessed locations, of which 85% were in camp-like settings and 10% in host communities. The second most commonly reported source of food is local market, as recorded in 35% of locations of which 28% were in camp-like settings and 7% in host communities.

Graph 8: percentages of locations by settlement and main sources of food.

Source of fuel: the most reported source of fuel was the local forest. This was indicated in 75% of assessed locations, of which 65% in camp-like settings and 10% in host communities. The second most common source of fuel was the local market. This was reported in 18% of locations, 14% in camp-like settings and 4% in host communities.

Copying strategies: The most commonly reported copying strategy regarding food consumption was eating less food than normal, as indicated in 47% of assessed locations. This was followed by borrowing food, reported in 34% of locations, and adults eating less to leave more food for children, as recorded in 31% of locations.

Source of income: in 89% of locations it was reported that refugees had no income at all. In 6% of locations, refugees reportedly engaged in irregular daily labor or casual work, in 2% in small business or petty trade.
Access to nutritional supplements: in 41% of locations it was reported that refugees had no access to nutritional supplements for pregnant or lactating women, either because the service was not available or because the service existed, but it was difficult to access. Likewise, in 38% of locations KIs reported difficulties accessing nutritional supplements for children.

PROTECTION

Safety: KIs were asked about the most common places or situations where security incidents take place. The most frequently reported were latrines, followed by firewood collection and bathing facilities. Places subject to security incidents were however very different depending on the age and sex of refugees. Latrines were reported to be risky for children in 89% of locations and for women in 69% of locations, while for men only in 11% of locations. Similarly, bathing facilities were reportedly risky for children in 34% of location, for men in 5%, while for women in 65%. Conversely, firewood collection was reported to be a situation where incidents were likely to happen to men in 88% of locations, while for children and women only in 20% and 23% respectively.

Graph 9: percentage of locations reporting on places where security incidents take place.

Services: KIs were asked about child friendly spaces and women safe spaces. In 37% of locations KIs reported that no child friendly space is available, while in 25% the KIs reported not to know what kind of services were provided in a child friendly space. Similarly, KIs in 32% of locations reported not to be aware of the services provided in women safe spaces, and in 44% that the service was not available.

Restriction of movements: in 96% of locations it was reported that refugees experience difficulties or feel restricted in their movements, particularly at check points. In 73% of locations firewood collection was also reported among the situations where refugees feel restricted in their movements.

EDUCATION

Access: in 94% of locations it was reported that children had access to formal or informal education services, reachable within 30 minutes on foot.

Barriers: in 36% of locations it was reported that adolescent girls encounter barriers to access education, while 8% reported the same for adolescent boys. Social norms and values were reported to be the main reason affecting adolescent girls’ access to education in 25% of locations, and boys’ in 8%. The lack of an appropriate school program, or of book and equipment, were given the same importance by KIs (1% and 5% respectively), with no significant differences between boys and girls. Finally, safety and
security were reported among the main reasons preventing adolescent girls from accessing school in 4% of locations, while no KI reported the same for boys.

Graph 10: percentage of locations reporting on barriers for adolescents to access education.

**Risks and challenges:** in 22% of locations it was reported that distance was a challenge and had an impact on children’s ability to reach school. In 38% of locations, safety and security were also mentioned among the challenges and risks faced by children to access education services.

**Teachers:** in 58% of locations, KIs mentioned the presence of trained teachers who were not working at that moment in schools or learning centers.

**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES (CwC)**

**Source of information:** in 95% of locations, KIs reported that refugees address majhees get information about services, distributions, etc. It is worth remembering however, that the interviewed KIs are mostly majhees. In 30% of locations it is also reported that information is received from home visits by volunteers/staff, in 29% from NGO workers, 24% from word of mouth and 22% from army.

All NPM products including NPM Site Assessment 8 full dataset and methodology are available at:

- **Global DTM: Bangladesh** ([http://www.globaldtm.info/bangladesh/](http://www.globaldtm.info/bangladesh/))

For any queries, please contact: npmbangladesh@iom.int