IOM BANGLADESH
Needs and Population Monitoring (NPM)
Site Assessment: Round 15 (1 May - 24 June 2019)

Revised estimate of Rohingya Refugee population in Cox’s Bazar – 24 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total locations assessed</th>
<th>Total households</th>
<th>Total individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040</strong> Locations Assessed</td>
<td><strong>1,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>814,926</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>215,198</strong> Total Households</td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,522</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>942,517</strong> Total Individuals</td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,069</strong></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 community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total locations assessed</td>
<td><strong>1,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td><strong>186,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,703</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total individuals</td>
<td><strong>814,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW

IOM Bangladesh Needs and Population Monitoring (NPM) is part of the IOM’s global Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) programming. 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 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.

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 NPM 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

As of round 15 (1 May - 24 June), in order to incorporate female perspectives into the Site Assessment in a systematic manner effort were made to conduct female key informant interviews in each of the 1956 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 15, 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 (eg. female Majhee assistant) or who holds knowledge of the location due to their role (eg. 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 (eg. shopkeeper, tailor), and as a last effort tried to find a local Rohingya woman (eg. 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 Quarterly basis (every 3 months)
- On average, during a four week 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 15) was conducted between 1 May and 24 June 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, 34,172 were registered refugees (UNHCR, June 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.

**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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>39,751</td>
<td>174,054</td>
<td>215,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>176,880</td>
<td>759,380</td>
<td>942,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Further information available in NPM Methodology document.
². Data from [UNHCR Family Counting Factsheet (30 June 2019)](UNHCR Family Counting Factsheet (30 June 2019)).
Map 1: Distribution of Individuals, by type of site
Site Density: No major changes related to site density were noted between round 14 and round 15 apart from in Camp 17 and Camp 23 (Shamlapur). In both camps, the average m² per person reduced. In Camp 17 m² per person decreased from 52 m² in round 14 to 49 m² in round 15. For Camp 23 (Shamlapur), m² per person decreased quite significantly from 135 m² in round 14 to 116 m² in round 15.

As highlighted in previous rounds, congestion continues to be a significant issue in the refugee camps. The average m² per person for round 15 decreased to 23 m². This continues to be lower than the sphere standard of 30 m² for each person.

3. These figures were calculated at the block level rather than camp level, which highlights an important distinction. Calculations at the block level provide a more reliable estimation of density in habitable areas. Calculations using camp boundary levels provide a much higher and unrealistic density as they include areas such as rice paddy fields, host community locations, canals, streams, etc.
SHELTER

Shelter Needs:
Respondents identified tarpaulin and big bamboo as their 1st and 2nd priority shelter needs. The 3rd most commonly identified priority shelter needs were rope and small bamboo. Female KIs reported very similar responses – 75% of female KIs identified tarpaulin as their 1st priority need and 63% identified big bamboo as the 2nd priority need.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big Bamboo</th>
<th>Tarpaulin sheets</th>
<th>Nails</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Plywood</th>
<th>Rope</th>
<th>Sandbags</th>
<th>Small Bamboo</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Priority Shelter Need</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Priority Shelter Need</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Priority Shelter Need</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Safety Concerns:
Unstable structure, shelter deterioration and no adequate lighting in houses were reported as the main shelter safety concern by both male KIs and female KIs. A higher proportion of female KIs reported shelter deterioration as their first and second shelter safety concerns (male KI: 23%; female KI: 31%). No adequate lighting in houses were highlighted as second and third safety concerns by both male and female respondents. This also corresponds to the priority household items as torches/solar lamps were reported as key needs.

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>First shelter safety concern</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second shelter safety concern</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third shelter safety concern</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable structure</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Deterioration</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adequate lighting in houses</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

Problems regarding access to water:
Issues raised regarding water access by both male KIs and female KIs were related to the water points. The most reported issues were long waiting times (male KI: 52%; female KI: 67%), lack of sufficient water points (male KI: 51%; female KI: 43%), water points not functioning (male KI: 38%; female KI: 36%) and distance to water points (male KI: 37%; female KI: 45%). Female KIs reported distance to the water points as a more significant issue than male KIs – 45% of female KIs compared to 37% of male KIs. 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.
Problems related to latrine and bathing facility access:
The most frequently reported issue related to latrine and bathing facility access was a lack of separation between female and male spaces. This issue was reported by male and female KIs at similar proportions.

Latrine Access:
Lack of separation was reported by 72% of female KIs and 68% of male KIs as the main problem associated with accessing latrines. The second most commonly reported issue was that latrines are unclean/unhygienic (male KI: 46%; female KI: 44%). Female KIs reported latrines being too far away as a barrier more frequently than their male counterparts (male KI: 15%; female KI: 24%).

Graph 3: Types of problems accessing latrines by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI
**Bathing facility access:**

Similarly, the lack of gender separation of bathing facilities was reported as a key access barrier by 69% of female KIs and 63% of male KIs. Not enough water was the second most reported problem related to bathing access. Male KIs were more likely to report a lack of sufficient lighting as a barrier compared to women (male KI: 44%; female KI: 34%). In contrast, female KIs were once again more likely to highlight distance as a barrier to accessing bathing facilities - **25% of female KIs reported bathing facilities to be too far away compared to only 15% of male KIs.**

**Graph 4: Types of problems accessing bathing facilities by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI**

- **No separation between men and women:** 63% female, 69% male
- **There is not enough water:** 36% female, 46% male
- **Bathing facilities do not have sufficient lighting:** 35% female, 44% male
- **There are not enough facilities/too crowded:** 24% female, 28% male
- **Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic:** 18% female, 23% male
- **Facilities are too far away:** 15% female, 25% male
- **Bathing facilities are non-functional:** 6% female, 8% male
- **There are no facilities:** 8% female, 11% male
- **It is not safe / private (no door, no lock, etc):** 10% female, 8% male

**Safety concerns:**

Lack of adequate lighting, gender separation and locks were highlighted as issues across most of the locations with minimal variation between male KI responses and female KI responses.
- Only 7% of female KIs reported that bathing facilities in their locations were separated between men and women. Male KIs reported a slightly higher figure – 17%.

**Graph 5: Safety concerns related to WASH facilities by percentage of assessed location and gender of KI**

- **Bathing Facilities**
  - Male KI: 17%
  - Female KI: 9%
- **Latrines**
  - Male KI: 9%
  - Female KI: 8%

- **Separated between men and women**
- **Locks on the inside**
- **Adequate lighting surrounding all facilities**
Map 3: Female bathing practices
Map 4: Male bathing practices

Legend:
- Bathing in communal/public bathing facilities
- Bathing in private bathing facilities in their shelters
- Showering outdoors or in open areas
- No bathing facilities
Bathing Practices:

- Significant variation was found in bathing practices for women and girls compared to men and boys (Map 3 and 4).
- Both male and female KIs reported that women and girls were more likely to bathe in private, makeshift facilities in their shelters (male KI: 78%; female KI: 85%). Overall this trend has increased since round 14 (February 2019). During Site Assessment 14, 68% of male KIs reported women and girls bathing inside their shelters. This has now increased to 78% as of round 15.
- Just over half of female KIs reported that men bathe in outdoor or in open areas in their location. Male respondents reported a slightly lower figure of 43%.

Graph 6: Bathing practices by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Bathing practices for women and girls</th>
<th>Bathing practices for men and boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female KI</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male KI</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to health facilities:

The majority of male (90%) as well as female (92%) KIs reported accessible static health facilities within 30 minutes walking distance. The finding is consistent with the previous rounds of assessments.

Graph 7: Distance to nearest health facility by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI

Problems accessing 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%).
Although health facilities are within 30 minutes walking distance, a higher number of male and female KIs reported having problems accessing health facilities at night. The most commonly reported problem related to accessing health facilities at night was that local health facilities are closed (male KI: 41%; female KI: 48%).

**Specific groups of people having health service accessibility problems:**

The most commonly reported group of people facing problems accessing healthcare services are elderly persons (male KI: 73%; female KI: 73%) followed by persons with disabilities (male KI: 50%; female KI: 56%) and children (male KI: 52%; female KI: 47%).

**Graph 8: Types of problems accessing health facilities by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI**

**Graph 9: Groups of people facing health service access problems by percentage of assessed locations and gender of KI**
**FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS**

**Source of food:**
The most commonly reported source of food was food distribution/assistance (male KI: 92%; female KI: 97%) followed by purchasing with cash (male KI: 41%; female KI: 46%) and purchasing on credit (male KI: 27%; female KI: 37%).

**Access to food distribution:**
Almost one-fourth of the assessed locations (male KI: 26%; female KI: 25%) reported not having problems accessing food distributions. However, a range of other types of problems were reported. The most commonly reported problem was that the waiting time at the distribution points are too long (male KI: 56%; female KI: 58%) followed by distribution points being too far (male KI: 43%; female KI: 47%) and individuals not able to carry distribution items (male KI: 29%; female KI: 28%).

**Graph 10: Types of problems accessing food distribution by accessed location and gender of KI**

KIs reported on changes in accessibility to food in the 30 days prior to data collection and the majority reported no change have occurred (male KI: 75%; female KI: 71%). A small proportion of assessed location reported decreased access (distribution is not regular, or amount is not enough) as one of the changes (male KI: 8%; female: 11%) followed by increase in food prices (male KI: 7%; female KI: 11%).

**Main source of income:**
Like previous rounds of assessments, KIs reported lack of income generating activities as work opportunities are limited in the camps and prohibited outside.
- The predominant response continues to be no income source (male KI: 54%; female KI: 64%).
- The most commonly reported source of income was unskilled wage labour (male KI: 32%; female KI: 27%) followed by petty trade/street vendor/ small business (male KI: 17%; female KI: 16%) and sale of humanitarian assistance (male KI: 20%; female KI: 13%).
Graph 11: Source of income by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No income source</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled wage labour</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade / street vendor / Small business</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual day labour</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled wage labour</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances FROM abroad</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural production and sales</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 12: Barriers accessing nutrition facilities by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No barriers accessing nutrition facilities</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting times are too long</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The centre is too far away</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical obstacles and terrain reduce access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of services (when or where)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non gender separated areas</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety en route to or at the distribution point</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUTRITION**

A higher proportion of male (57%) KIs reported having no barriers accessing nutrition facilities relative to female KIs (46%). The most commonly reported barrier was long waiting times at the distribution points (male KI: 30%; Female KI: 44%) followed by the centre being too far (male KI: 20%; female KI: 28%).
Barriers accessing education:
Male and female KIs reported on barriers accessing education for children across different age groups including girls and boys aged 3-5 years, 6-14 years and 15-18 years. It was observed that with an increase in age, reporting on barriers increased.
- The majority of male KIs and female KIs reported that boys (male KI: 96%; female KI: 99%) and girls (male KI: 96%; female KI: 99%) between age 3-5 years do not face barriers accessing education.
- For boys (male KI: 26%; female KI: 27%) and girls (male KI: 34%; female KI: 37%) aged 6-14 years, a slight increase in barriers accessing education was reported by male and female KIs relative to the younger age group. Findings show that girls in this age group face more barriers than boys accessing education.
- The majority of male and female KIs reported that boys (male KI: 84%; female KI: 96%) and girls (male KI: 89%; female KI: 98%) aged 15-18 years face barriers accessing education. **Like the previous age group, girls between 15-18 years face more barrier than boys.**

**Graph 14: Boys and girls across different age group facing barriers accessing education by percentage of locations assessed and gender of KI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
<th>Male KI</th>
<th>Female KI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 3-5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 3-5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 6-14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 6-14</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 15-18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 15-18</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 15-18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of barrier accessing education:
Male and female KIs that reported children facing barriers to accessing education were further asked to report on the type of barriers they faced. Some of the most commonly reported barriers were a **lack of appropriate education programme**, **distance and lack of transport**, **social norms and values** (family/community restriction) and **safety and security risks**.

**Table 5: Types of barriers accessing education by percentage of location assessed and gender of KI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distance and/or lack of transport</th>
<th>Lack of appropriate education programme</th>
<th>Need to engage in other livelihood activities</th>
<th>No school equipment and books</th>
<th>Safety and security risks</th>
<th>Social norms &amp; values (family/community restriction)</th>
<th>Unable to continue education due to marriage</th>
<th>What is taught is not useful/age appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 3-5</td>
<td>Male KI: 17%</td>
<td>Male KI: 31%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 4%</td>
<td>Male KI: 39%</td>
<td>Male KI: 7%</td>
<td>Male KI: 1%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 28%</td>
<td>Female KI: 32%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 12%</td>
<td>Female KI: 20%</td>
<td>Female KI: 8%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 3-5</td>
<td>Male KI: 16%</td>
<td>Male KI: 34%</td>
<td>Male KI: 1%</td>
<td>Male KI: 4%</td>
<td>Male KI: 37%</td>
<td>Male KI: 4%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 32%</td>
<td>Female KI: 41%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 14%</td>
<td>Female KI: 9%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 6-14</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
<td>Male KI: 47%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 1%</td>
<td>Male KI: 5%</td>
<td>Male KI: 39%</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 1%</td>
<td>Female KI: 42%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 54%</td>
<td>Female KI: 2%</td>
<td>Female KI: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 6-14</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
<td>Male KI: 80%</td>
<td>Male KI: 5%</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 3%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 1%</td>
<td>Female KI: 71%</td>
<td>Female KI: 13%</td>
<td>Female KI: 1%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 5%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls aged 15-18</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 33%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 3%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 50%</td>
<td>Male KI: 9%</td>
<td>Male KI: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 28%</td>
<td>Female KI: 63%</td>
<td>Female KI: 26%</td>
<td>Female KI: 4%</td>
<td>Female KI: 1%</td>
<td>Female KI: 61%</td>
<td>Female KI: 3%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys aged 15-18</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 4%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 4%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female KI: 57%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 28%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Female KI: 0%</td>
<td>Male KI: 10%</td>
<td>Male KI: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As highlighted in Table 5, differences can be observed between male KIs and female KIs regarding certain responses. For example, for boys and girls aged 3-5 years as well as aged 15-18, a higher number of female KIs have reported distance and/or lack of transport as a barrier to education compared to male KIs. Similarly, for boys and girl aged 15-18, more male KIs reported a lack of appropriate education programme as a barrier relative to female KIs. For girls aged 15-18 the reported barriers to education varied significantly between male and female KIs. Male KIs reported social norms and values and predominant barrier (50%). In contrast, female KIs reported safety and security risks as the main barrier for girls aged 15-18.

**PROTECTION**

**Safety Problems:**

Across all assessed locations, a higher proportion of male KIs as well as female KIs reported that there are no problems related to safety 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, KIs (both male and female) reported that girls and women commonly faced safety problems at bathing/washing facility, waterpoints and latrines.
- For boys and men, market, distribution sites and firewood collection sites were the most commonly reported locations for safety problems.

**Table 6: Type of location with safety problems by percentage of assessed location 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>Bathing/washing facility</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution site</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood collection site</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No safety problems</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpoints</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in the table 6 above, we can observe that no major difference in responses were observed between male/ KIs and female KIs except for some safety issues for women and men over 18 years. For example, for men aged 18 years or above a greater number of female KIs (25%) reported distribution sites as an unsafe location relative to male KIs (13%). Similarly, for women aged 18 years or above, female KIs reported that there were no safety issues to a lesser extent than male KIs (male KI: 48%; female KI: 36%).

**Reporting mechanism:**

The majority of male KIs (94%) and female KIs (99%) reported that in case of an attack or crime they would report to the majhee. This is consistent with the findings from previous rounds of assessments. The second most common response was the army followed by CiC. Female KIs were less likely to state that their community reports cases of attacks or crimes to the army (male KI: 60%; female KI: 47%) and CiC’s (male KI: 45%; female KI: 33%) than male KIs.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES (CWC)

Complaint and feedback mechanisms:

- A high proportion of male KIs (73%) and female (73%) KIs reported presence of option to make complaint or provide feedback about humanitarian assistance. However, 23% of male KI and 19% of female KI reported having no option to make complaints or provide feedback.
- Both male (69%) and female (69%) KIs reported that aid providers take opinions of majority of the people from the location into account while providing aid services.
- Seventy-one percent (71%) of male KIs and 70% of female KIs reported that majority of the people from the location know about services available in the area. They also reported that most people in their location have seen/heard of communication/awareness material such as posters, leaflets and banners (male KI: 74%; female KI: 70%).

Graph 15: Complaint, feedback mechanisms and dissemination of information by percentage of location assessed and gender of KI
Dates of assessment: 01 May - 24 June 2019
Data sources: IOM NPM, ISCG
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