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Site Assessment: Round 16 (21 August - 10 October 2019)

Revised estimate of Rohingya Refugee population in Cox’s Bazar – October 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations Assessed</th>
<th>Total Individuals</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>New Arrivals since August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>944,682</td>
<td>213,636</td>
<td>731,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of individuals and households by type of site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of settlement</th>
<th>Collective site</th>
<th>Rohingya refugees in collective sites with host community</th>
<th>Rohingya refugees in dispersed sites with host comunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total locations assessed</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>185,148</td>
<td>26,074</td>
<td>2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total individuals</td>
<td>818,625</td>
<td>115,331</td>
<td>10,726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW

IOM Bangladesh Needs and Population Monitoring (NPM) is part of the IOM’s global Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) programing. DTM is IOM’s information management system to track and monitor population displacement during crises. Composed of several tools and processes, DTM regularly captures and analyzes multilayered data and disseminates information products that help better understand the evolving needs of the displaced population, whether on site or en route.

Context

Following an outbreak of extreme 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 Ukhaa 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.

Methodology

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 collective and dispersed settlements, locations in host communities and formal refugee camps. Information is collected by a team of up to 110 enumerators through a mixed-methods approach: Field level key informant (KI) interviews using a closed-ended KoBo questionnaire are conducted.

The assessment provides an overview of key population figures, living conditions, needs of populations across all locations covered by the Site Assessment. The data collected by the assessment focuses primarily on displacement trends and figures, multi-sectoral vulnerabilities, priorities of assistance, and future objectives. The questionnaire has been compiled to support the Inter Sector Coordination Group (ISCG) with sectors leaders and their information managements teams engaged throughout.

Geographic Unit of Reference and Key Informants

Depending on the settlement type, the geographic unit of reference and the source of information change within the NPM methodology, which is adapted to different contexts. However, in order to maintain ease of reference the term ‘location’ is used throughout the tool in order to refer to the key informants area of influence and the area about which they are answering questions.

Collective sites: the unit of reference is the majhee block. A majhee is a community leader, belonging to the Rohingya refugee population. A block is the portion of a settlement for which he/she is responsible. Majhees tend to be used as a focal point to deliver services in each block, they are predominantly males, and are NPM’s main key informants.

(Formal) Refugee camps: as formal refugee camps were established in the 90s, a former block system coexists with a new block system, developed with the new influx. NPM was given access by UNHCR to the majhees inside the two formal refugee camps during NPM SA Round 7. From NPM SA Round 1 to 6, NPM reported solely the figures of registered refugees provided by UNHCR, including pre- and post-August 2017. The figure was then reported on a site/camp level and no further breakdown was provided. From NPM SA Round 1 to 6 no needs assessment was conducted.

Host community locations: the geographic unit of reference is the village.
Female Key Informant Component

In order to incorporate female perspectives into the Site Assessment in a systematic manner, effort has been made since NPM SA round 15 to conduct female key informant interviews in each of the 1945 locations in refugee camps. This process and the design of the data collection methodology involved extensive field level design and piloting with female field staff. During round 16, female enumerators identified and interviewed female KIs in all locations in refugee camps, reaching 100% coverage.

So as to maintain transparency, remove suspicion, and protect the respondent, Majhee’s were informed at the field level of the plan to interview a female key informant. They were asked, if available, to identify any female in a position of authority (e.g., female Majhee assistant) or who holds knowledge of the location due to their role (e.g., teacher, health worker, humanitarian volunteer). If reported to be unavailable, female enumerators on the ground attempted to identify the same characters through interactions with Rohingya women in the location. Failing this, female enumerators tried to identify women in a position of trade (e.g., shopkeeper, tailor), and as a last effort tried to find a local Rohingya woman (e.g., housewife) who was willing to be interviewed and give information on the community in her location. Interviews were conducted as best as possible in private, with the respondent predominantly inside her own shelter. A male enumerator remained out of earshot but nearby, in order to monitor the area and, if necessary, steer away any unwanted attention.

As a result of this exercise, NPM now has a comprehensive dataset which can be used for analysis against the majhee KI dataset. In this report, points of comparison and differences between male and female KIs responses will be highlighted.

Timeframe and data collection cycle

- A full NPM Site Assessment is conducted on average on a Quartely basis (every 3 months)
- On average, during a four weeks data collection period a single round of the NPM SA collects approximately 2000 interviews with individual KIs.
- With the inclusion of female KIs the data collection period extends to approximately 7 weeks as the number of interviews are essentially doubled.

At the end of each exercise, baseline or assessment, NPM publicly shares its most updated information on population figures on a variety of online platforms, including the NPM Portal, HDX, Humanitarian Response, and OpenAerialMap.

A comprehensive methodology document can be found here.

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

This assessment (round 16) was conducted between 21 August and 10 October 2019.

Across all the assessed locations, 84% of refugees were living in collective sites, 12% in collective sites with host communities, and 4% in dispersed sites in host communities.\(^1\)

Of the total population, 34,917 were registered refugees (UNHCR, September 2019)\(^2\), who live in the only two formal refugee camps (Kutupalong and Nayapara refugee camps), counting for less than 4% of the total identified refugee population. The remaining 96% were unregistered refugees who live in all locations including the formal refugee camps.

The majority of the Rohingya refugees live in Ukhia Upazila, comprising 81% of the total households and 80% of individuals. The second largest group lives in Teknaf, comprising 19% of households and 19% of individuals.

---

1 The ISCG and Site Management Sector revised the definitions of the site types in March 2018. The classification is confirmed while names are provisional.
2 Data from UNHCR Family Counting Factsheet (30 September 2019).
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>Ukphia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>39,806</td>
<td>172,492</td>
<td>213,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4,252</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>177,638</td>
<td>761,130</td>
<td>944,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 1: Distribution of Individuals, by type of site
Shelter Needs:

Male and female respondents identify tarpaulin (male KI: 71%; female KI: 76%) and big bamboo (male KI: 59%; female KI: 57%) as their 1st and 2nd priority shelter needs. These findings are consistent with the shelter needs from NPM SA round 15. The 3rd most commonly identified priority shelter needs by male KI was small bamboo (41%) whereas for female KI was rope (36%).

Table 3: Priority shelter needs by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big Bamboo</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Plywood</th>
<th>Rope</th>
<th>Sandbags</th>
<th>Small Bamboo</th>
<th>Tarpaulin sheets</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Needs:

Floor mat (male KI: 23%; female KI: 26%) was the most commonly reported important family item (not including food or cash) needed by families in their locations. An increase in reporting of floor mats can be observed in this round compared to NPM SA round 15. Differences were observed between male and female KIs for the second most important family item: higher proportions of male KIs reported fan (21%) as the second most important family item whereas female KIs reported mosquito nets (22%) and torch/solar lamps (22%).

Main Safety Concerns:

Some of the most commonly reported safety concerns by male and female KIs were unstable structure, shelter deterioration and no adequate lighting in houses. No major changes were observed between reporting from NPM SA round 15 to round 16.

Table 4: Shelter concerns by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st shelter safety concern</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd shelter safety concern</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd shelter safety concern</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable structure</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Deterioration</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adequate lighting in</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

Problems regarding access to water:

Tube wells and handpumps continue to remain the main source of water. Like NPM SA round 15, issues raised regarding water access by both male KIs and female KIs were related to the water points. The most commonly reported water access problems were long waiting times (male KI: 55%; female KI: 62%), lack of sufficient water points (male KI: 44%; female KI: 39%), water points not functioning (male KI: 32%; female KI: 30%) and distance to water points (male KI: 38%; female KI: 48%). As indicated, female KIs continued (since round 15) to report distance to the water points as a more significant problem relative to male KIs.4

Graph 1: Problems accessing water by percentage of assessed location and gender of KI

Coping Strategy:

Male and female KIs were asked to report on coping strategies practiced by members in the community in case of water shortage. The most commonly reported coping strategy was going further away from the usual spot for fetch water (male KI: 50%; female KI: 59%) followed by reduction in water consumption for hygiene practices (male KI: 31%; female KI: 41%) and reducing drinking water consumption (male KI: 18%; female KI: 21%). The reporting on top three coping strategies has been consistent since NPM SA round 8.

Problems related to latrine and bathing facility access:

Like NPM SA round 15, lack of separation between female and male facilities continue to remain the most commonly reported issue related to latrine and bathing facility access. Higher proportion of female KIs reported the issue relative to male KI.

4. Women may be more likely to have reported this as a greater issue as they are usually responsible for completing this task for their families. They are therefore more likely to have a greater awareness of the challenges associated with collecting water.
Latrine Access:
As aforementioned, **lack of separation between men and women facilities** was the most commonly reported problem related to accessing latrine (male KI: 64%; female KI: 75%). The second most commonly reported issue by male KI was insufficient lighting in toilet areas (48%) where the female KI reported that latrines are unclean/unhygienic (54%). Toilets being full/ non-functional was the third most commonly reported problem by both male KI (42%) and female KI (46%).

Graph 2: Types of problems accessing latrines by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No separation between men and women</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets are full / non-functional</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet areas do not have sufficient lighting</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not enough facilities/too crowded</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are too far away</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not safe / private (no door, no lock, etc)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People prefer to defecate outdoors</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no latrines</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference could be seen between male KI and female KI responses on the issues related to facilities being too far away. The reason behind this could be because females are more likely to have movement restrictions compared to males due cultural as well as safety/security reasons.

Bathing facility access:
Like the latrine access problem, the lack of gender separation of bathing facilities was also most commonly reported by female KIs (69%) compared to male KIs (57%). The second most common problems reported was that bathing facilities do not have sufficient lighting (male KI: 46%; female KI: 41%) followed by not having enough water (male KI: 35%; female KI: 34%). Female KIs were once again more likely to highlight distance as a barrier to accessing bathing facilities - **30% of female KIs reported bathing facilities to be too far away compared to only 13% of male KIs.**

---

5. KIs could report on more than one option.
6. The proportion of female KI reporting continues to be the exact same proportion as NPM SA round 15 (69%).
Bathing Practices:

- Significant variation was found in bathing practices for women and girls compared to men and boys (Map 2 and 3).
- Like NPM SA round 15, both male and female KIs reported that women and girls were more likely to bathe in private, makeshift facilities in their shelters (male KI: 80%; female KI: 85%).
- A higher proportion of female KIs (62%) reported that boys and men shower outdoors or in open areas relative to make KIs (44%).

7. KIs could report more than one option.
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HEALTH

Access to health facilities:
The most commonly reported problems accessing health facilities were long waiting times (male KI: 62%; female KI: 71%), insufficient types of health services (male KI: 66%; female KI: 63%) and health facility being too far away (male KI: 25%; female KI: 21%).

Graph 4: Distance to nearest health facility by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

Specific groups of people having health service accessibility problems:
The most commonly reported group of people facing problems accessing health care services are elderly persons (male KI: 68%; female KI: 67%). This reporting is consistent with the previous round of NPM SA data. The second most commonly reported group of people by male KIs (48%) was women whereas the second most commonly reported group by female KIs (51%) was children. A higher proportion of male KI (48%) identify women as a group facing problems accessing health facilities relative to female KI (38%).

Graph 5: Groups of people facing health service access problems by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI
Problems accessing health facilities:
The most common health access problem reported was long waiting time in the facilities (male KI: 58%; female KI: 74%). A significant difference can be observed between male KI and female KI reporting. The second most common problem reported was insufficient types of health services (male KI: 57%; female KI: 65%). The third most common problem reported by male KI (22%) was no medicine. In contrast only female KIs (8%) reported no medicine as an issue. Another commonly reported problem was that health facilities were too far (male KI: 21%; female KI: 18%).

Graph 6: Types of problem accessing health facilities by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

- Waiting times are too long: Male KI 58%, Female KI 74%
- Insufficient types of health services: Male KI 57%, Female KI 65%
- No medicines: Male KI 8%, Female KI 22%
- Health facility is too far away: Male KI 18%, Female KI 21%
- Health facility staff do not provide capable care: Male KI 13%, Female KI 11%
- Not aware of available health services: Male KI 2%, Female KI 5%
- Accessible time, only during day: Male KI 6%, Female KI 4%
- Lack of female healthcare staff: Male KI 6%, Female KI 2%
- Healthcare is too expensive: Male KI 4%, Female KI 4%
- Physical access, terrain, and safety on route: Male KI 4%, Female KI 2%

Male and female KI were asked to report on problems accessing health facilities at night, and the most common problem reported by both male KI (35%) and female KI (44%) was that local health facilities are closed at night. This reporting is consistent with NPM SA round 15. Although the majority of male KIs and female KIs report that most health facilities are within 30 minutes of walking distance, another common problem accessing health facilities at night was distance and lack of transport/ambulance (male KI: 16%; female KI: 6%).

8. The findings from this round is consistent with the NPM SA round 15.
Main source of food:
The main source of food, as reported by the KIs, continues to be food distribution/assistance (male KI: 91%; female KI: 97%) followed by purchasing with cash (male KI: 42%; female KI: 52%) and purchasing with credit (male KI: 27%; female KI: 39%). A significant difference can be observed between male KI and female KI responses for purchasing food with credit and with cash.

Access to food distribution:
The problems raised by male and female KIs regarding access to distribution is mostly related to the distribution points and significant differences can be observed between male KI and female KI responses. A higher proportion of male KIs (36%) reported facing no problem accessing food distribution relative to female KIs (25%). This could be attributed to the multiple reasons such as women having more restrictions of movement as compared to men, lower proportions of women having access to income generating activities compared to men, etc. In this background, the most commonly reported problem was regarding long waiting times at distribution points (male KI: 45%; female KI: 58%) followed by distribution points being too far (male KI: 41%; female KI: 50%). Other problems reported included not being able to afford to pay porters (male KI: 20%; female KI: 34%) and cannot carry distribution items (male KI: 23%; female KI: 31%).

Graph 7: Types of problems accessing food distribution by percentage of assessed location and gender of KI

KIs were asked to report on changes they faced accessing food in the 30 days prior to data collection and a majority reported no changes occurred (male KI: 79%; female KI: 71%). Consistent with the previous NPM SA round 15, a small proportion of assessed locations reported a decrease in access, which was attributed to distributions not being regular, or the amount is not enough (male KI: 6%; female KI: 10%) and increase in food prices (male: 6%; female KI: 13%).

9. KIs could report up to two main sources of food for people in their location.
10. Joint Multi Sector Needs Assessment conducted in August-September 2019 show that 2% of women have worked to earn income compared 27% of men 30 days prior to data collection.
Main source of Income:
Like previous rounds of NPM SA, a high proportion of male KI (55%) and female KI (55%) reported no income source due to limited work opportunities inside the camps. The most commonly reported main source of income was unskilled wage labour (male KI: 27%; female KI: 38%) followed by petty trade/street vendor/small business (male KI: 19%; female KI: 17%), sale of humanitarian assistance (male KI: 19%; female KI: 15%) and casual day labour (male KI: 17%; female KI: 9%).

Graph 8: Main income sources by percentage of assessed location and gender of KI

KIs were asked to report on any changes in income source in the 30 days prior to data collection and a majority of male as well as female KIs reported no changes have occurred (male KI: 80%; female KI: 72).

Access to nutrition facilities:
Like NPM SA round 15, a higher proportion of male KIs (67%) reported having no barriers accessing nutrition facilities (supplementary feeding programs) relative to female KIs (55%). This could be attributed to the fact that women are generally the primary caregiver and hence more likely to be accessing nutrition facilities on a regular basis. Some of the more commonly reported barriers were related to distribution points, such as long waiting time at the distribution points (male KI: 22%; female KI: 38%) and distribution centres being too far away (male KI: 15%; female KI: 23%).

11 A slightly higher proportion of female KI in round 15 (64%) reported no income source relative to round 16 (55%).
Graph 9: Barriers accessing nutrition facilities by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

Educatio

Barriers accessing education:

Like the findings in the previous round of NPM SA, barriers accessing education for children across different age groups for girls and boys increases with increase in age (Table 5).

Table 5: Boys and girls across different age group facing barriers accessing education by percentage of accessed location and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of barrier</th>
<th>Do not face barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male KI 3-5</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI 3-5</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI 6-14</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI 6-14</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI 15-18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female KI 15-18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of barriers accessing education:

Male and female KIs who reported children facing barriers accessing education in their location were further asked to report on types of barriers faced by boys and girls from each age group classified above.12

- For boys and girls aged 3-5, the common barriers reported were distance and/or lack of transport, lack of appropriate education programme and safety and security reasons.
- For boys aged 6-14, some common types of barriers reported was lack of appropriate education programme (male KI: 19%; female KI: 19%), what is taught is not useful/age appropriate (male KI: 1%; female KI: 1%). For girls aged 6-14, lack of appropriate education programme (male KI: 19%; female KI: 19%), social norms and values-family/community restrictions (male KI: 8%; female KI: 11%) were some common types of barriers.

12 The most commonly reported types of barriers for each age group is consistent with the previous round of NPM SA.
For boys aged 15-18, lack of appropriate education programme (male KI: 65%, female KI: 72%) and need to engage in other livelihood activities (male KI: 13%; female KI: 21%) were commonly reported types of barriers and for girls aged 15-18, social norms and values- family/community restrictions (male KI: 42%; female KI: 53%), lack of appropriate education programme (male KI: 43%; female KI: 40%) were most commonly reported.

**Safety Problems:**

Like previous round of NPM SA, across all assessed locations, a higher proportion of male KIs as well as female KIs reported that there are no safety problems for girls, boys, women and men in the 30 days prior to data collection. However, there are a range of other issues reported by the KIs.

- Consistent with previous rounds of assessment, both male KIs and female KIs reported that girls and women commonly faced safety problems at bathing/washing facility, waterpoints and latrines.
- For boys and men, market, WASH facilities and distribution sites were the most commonly reported locations for safety problems.

Table 6: Types of location with safety problems by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls under 18</th>
<th>Boys under 18</th>
<th>Women over 18</th>
<th>Men over 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>Female KI</td>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>Female KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpoints</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing/Washing facility</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution site</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood collection site</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No safety problems</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No major differences can be observed between the male KI and female KI reporting on different types of unsafe location, except expect in the case for latrine for adult women (male KI: 20%; female KI: 33%). Also, a lower proportion of male KI (46%) reported no safety problems for adult women relative to female KI (69%).

**Reporting mechanism:**

Like NPM SA round 15, a majority of male KI (95%) as well as female KI (100%) reported that in case of an attack or crime, they would report to the majhee. A slight change was seen in the order of rank for the second and third most common response. In round 16, CiC (male KI: 64%; female KI: 45%) were report as the second most common response followed by army (male KI: 39%; female KI: 35%).

13. In NPM SA round 15, army was the second most common response followed by CiC.
Graph 10: People or organisation Rohingya community reports to in cases of attack and crime by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Majhee</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Management Support</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leader</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, friends or neighbours</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGO/UN</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGO</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government official</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information hub</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 11: Complaint, feedback mechanisms and dissemination of information by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES (CWC)

Complaint and feedback mechanism:

- A majority of the male KIs (84%) as well as female KIs (77%) reported the presence of options to complaint or provide feedback about humanitarian assistance. An increase in male KI reporting can be observed between NPM SA round 15 (73%) and 16 (84%).
- A majority of male KIs (74%) and female KIs (74%) reported that aid providers take the opinions of majority of the people from the location while providing aid services.
- A slight increase in the reporting of male KIs (80%) as well as female KIs (77%) was observed regarding people’s knowledge about services available in the area when compared to NPM SA round 15.
- A majority of male KIs (80%) and female KIs (80%) reported that most people in their location have seen/heard of communication/awareness materials such as posters, leaflets and banners.