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METHODOLOGY

DESIGN

• Indicators selected by Sectors and subsequently reviewed and refined by MSNA TWG

COVERAGE

• Refugee MSNA: ~95 households in each of the 34 camps (3,418 in total)
• Host Community MSNA: ~100 households in each of the 11 Unions* (1,311 in total)

DATA COLLECTION

• All surveys conducted August 5 – September 15
• Enumerator teams were 50:50 male and female, comprised of 80 REACH and 24 IOM NPM enumerators

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY APPROACH

• Simple random sampling of shelter footprints in each Union and camp, producing results with a 95% confidence level a 10% margin of error for each Union and camp

*St. Martin's Island was not included in the target population
**Shahporir Dwip in Sabrang Union was inaccessible during data collection
The MSNA is not designed to be considered in isolation. Findings must be triangulated or supplemented with other data sources and considered within a larger rights-based or impact-based contextual framework.

Source: IMAWG, J-MSNA Concept Note
LIMITATIONS

- **Coverage:** Shahporir Dwip (Wards 7, 8, 9 in Sabrang Union) was inaccessible during data collection and not surveyed; the village of Hati Mura (Raja Palong) was also not accessible during data collection due to an inter-community dispute on that day, and was thus not surveyed. The findings cannot be extrapolated to sites that were not visited.

- **Proxy:** Data on individuals are collected by proxy from the respondent and not directly from household members themselves.

- **Respondent bias:** Certain indicators may be under-reported or over-reported due to the subjectivity and perceptions of respondents (especially "social desirability bias" – the tendency of people to provide what they perceive to be the "right" answers to certain questions).

- **Perceptions:** Questions on household perceptions do not directly reflect the realities of service provision or security conditions in camps and host community areas – only on individuals' perceptions of them.

- **Camp / union variations:** Differences between camps and unions that fall within the study's margin of error may represent random variation rather than "true" differences. Findings should be verified before making decisions on resource allocation.

- **Limitations of household quantitative surveys:** While household-level quantitative surveys seek to provide measurable information that can be generalized (and are representative) of the populations of interest, the methodology is not suited to provide in-depth explanations for complex issues. Thus, questions on 'how' or 'why' (e.g. reasons for feeling unsafe) are best suited to be explored through an accompanying qualitative component. Users are reminded to supplement and triangulate findings from this survey with other surveys and data sources.

- **Subset indicators:** indicators/findings that refer to a subset (a part of the overall population) (e.g. 'of households that did make shelter improvements…') may have a lower confidence level and a wider margin of error.

- **Timeframe of data collection:** Users are reminded that data collection occurred during the rainy season
Key findings: Refugee MSNA
MSNA data suggest that coverage of basic services is extensive within the constraints of the operating environment. Findings do not point to household-level outcomes indicative of widespread extreme gaps in basic living standards. This suggests that the response is in many respects successful in implementing provision of lifesaving assistance.
KEY FINDINGS – Refugee

Findings suggest that coverage of basic food needs is extensive, and not indicative of widespread gaps in food consumption patterns. This reflects a continuation of conditions reported in the 2018 Refugee influx Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA II).

% of households by Food Consumption Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor (&lt;28)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline (28-42)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable (&gt;42)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with poor food consumption scores were not found to exceed 9% in any camp.

* The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of 9 weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a 7-day recall period.

% of households reporting main source(s) of water used for drinking and cooking*

- Tube wells / borehole / hand pump: 76%
- Piped water tap / stand: 29%
- Rainwater collection: 2%
- Cart with tank / drum: 2%

99% of households reported accessing improved water sources for drinking and cooking.

*respondents could select multiple options.
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Findings suggest high prevalence of health-seeking behaviours among refugee populations.

97% of individuals that were reported to have an illness serious enough to require medical treatment sought treatment.

Most individuals were reported as seeking treatment at an NGO clinic.

35% of individuals were reported to have an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection, affecting 80% households overall (gender and age breakdown below).

Of individuals reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection who sought treatment (n = 5771), % by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 79%
- Private clinic: 29%
- Pharmacy /drug shop in market: 22%
- Government clinic: 8%

*respondents could select multiple options.
KEY FINDINGS – Refugee

Findings suggest that fuel needs are being met and that coverage is generally widespread. The proportion of households reporting exclusively using LPG has also increased from 75% in the June 2019 MSNA.

% of households reporting type of cooking fuel used in the 30 days prior to data collection*

- **88%** of households reported exclusively using LPG
- **2%** of households reported using self-collected firewood

*respondents could select multiple options. 11% of households reported using purchased firewood

% of households reporting what has been going well with assistance and services received in the past 6 months prior to data collection (top 5)**

- No need to collect firewood anymore: 52%
- Structural improvements in camps (roads, public areas): 47%
- Improved sanitation in camps: 37%
- Improved access to clean water: 31%
- Stronger shelter materials: 26%

*respondents could select multiple options.
76% of households reported feeling that their opinion was **always** or **sometimes** taken into account when providing aid / services.
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% of households reporting facing barriers to interacting with humanitarian workers

- None: 76% (Female respondents: 80%; Male respondents: 76%)
- Language differences: 12% (Female respondents: 9%; Male respondents: 12%)
- Do not understand terms (jargon): 14% (Female respondents: 5%; Male respondents: 14%)
- Humanitarian workers are rude or disrespectful: 4% (Female respondents: 2%; Male respondents: 4%)

78% of households reported facing no barriers to interacting with humanitarian workers
However, there remain outstanding gaps in access and coverage of basic goods and services. Some of these concerns may affect the refugee community as a whole, regardless of who or where they are.
32% of households did not make improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection, despite reporting the need to do so*

Of households that purchased shelter material to make improvements**, % by reason for purchasing materials***

- To prepare for natural hazards or weather: 59%
- To expand the house: 15%
- Original material not sufficient: 14%
- Preferred material not available: 8%
- Quality of received assistance not good: 4%

Of households not making improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection (n = 1555):

65% stated lack of enough money as a reason for not making improvements

34% of households reported purchasing materials (or exchanging other goods) in order to make improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

**Respondents could select multiple options
*** This question was only asked of households that reported purchasing shelter material to make improvements (n = 1136).

*Overall, 46% of households reported not making improvements to their shelter. However, a portion of these households reported not making improvements because there was no need to do so. This indicator reflects those households that did not report making any improvements but did report needing to.

KEY FINDINGS – Refugee
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% of households by household dietary diversity*

- 35% 0-2 food groups
- 43% 3 food groups
- 22% 4+ food groups

While findings suggest that households have managed to avoid “poor” food consumption outcomes, far too many continue to face ‘borderline’ conditions, particularly in regard to dietary diversity. A deeper analysis would be required to understand households’ risk of facing deteriorating outcomes in light of exiting precarious conditions.

*The standard module to calculate a Household Dietary Diversity Score (24-hour recall period) was not included in the questionnaire. These findings represent the % of households who reported consuming numbers of food groups at least 6-7 times during the 7 days prior to data collection.
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Not all households reported sufficient water quantities to meet basic needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic purposes</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<1% of households reported open defecation as their usual sanitation practice, yet:

1 in 4 households reported visible traces of human faeces in the vicinity (30 meters or less) of their accommodation in the 30 days prior to data collection

67% of households reported having soap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible faeces</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible waste</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible stagnant water</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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% of households reporting areas where male and female members feel unsafe (top 3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of households reporting at least one area where male (n = 552) and female (n = 765) members do not feel safe:

33% cited lack of enough light at night as a reason for male members feeling unsafe in these locations

(#2 most commonly reported reason, after fear of abduction)

50% cited lack of enough light at night as a reason for female members feeling unsafe in these locations

(#1 most commonly reported reason)

% of households reporting the number of (functioning) portable lamps they own

- At least 2: 20%
- Only 1: 40%
- None: 40%

*respondents could select 3 options. Male respondents were only asked to respond on behalf of male members of their households while female respondents were only asked to respond on behalf of female members of their household.
44% of households reported being visited by a community health worker in the past 2 weeks prior to data collection

Overall (by respondent gender)

- 36% Female respondent
- 52% Male respondent
% of households reporting what has **not** been going well with assistance and services received in the past 6 months prior to data collection*

- Poor or insufficient shelter materials: 29% (Female: 26%, Male: 32%)
- Insufficient access to income sources: 27% (Female: 24%, Male: 30%)
- Insufficient or not diverse enough foods: 29% (Female: 27%, Male: 31%)
- Insufficient camp infrastructure (roads, etc.): 26% (Female: 23%, Male: 29%)
- Health services are insufficient and/or of bad quality: 25% (Female: 22%, Male: 28%)
- Insufficient access to clean water: 23% (Female: 20%, Male: 26%)

44% of households reported facing challenges picking up aid distributions in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting challenges picking up aid distributions in the 30 days before data collection**

- None: 56%
- Long waiting times: 29%
- Distribution points are too far: 21%
- Needed to pay to transport items: 16%
- Pushing or verbal bullying in line: 14%

*respondents could select multiple options.
This question was asked of all households.
All respondents were asked to specify what was going well with assistance and services received in a separate question.

**respondents could select multiple options
KEY FINDINGS – Refugee

When the priority needs cited by refugees are ranked in order of importance, 'access to food' featured significantly higher than the second-ranked priority need (shelter materials / upgrades). The top 3 overall rank far higher than any other priority need cited by respondents.

% of households reporting the priority needs for which they require additional support (top 4, unranked)*

- **Access to food**: 54% (52%)
- **Shelter materials / upgrade**: 49% (46%)
- **Electricity (battery / solar)**: 50% (41%)
- **Access to income-generating activities**: 14% (30%)

% of households reporting the priority needs for which they require additional support (top 4, ranked)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Need</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Male Respondents</th>
<th>Female Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials / upgrade</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (solar, battery)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income generating activities / employment</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The ranking findings reflects a Borda Count methodology of 17 priority needs, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position in which each respondent ranks it.**

*proportion of households reporting each priority need as a top 3 need, unranked
In some cases, these gaps in coverage seem to disproportionately affect specific population groups or localities. Often, findings point to notable gaps for households living in southern Teknaf camps and/or in more mixed conditions with host communities.
Camp-level findings on food consumption score indicate wide variation in food consumption outcomes between different localities.

**Food Consumption Score**
Camp-level findings: % of households with a calculated FCS of ‘Acceptable’ (54% overall)

- Upper 4:
  - 78% Camp 23
  - 68% Camp 4 Ext.
  - 68% NRC
  - 67% Camps 14 & 8W

- Lower 4:
  - 44% Camp 10
  - 41% Camp 7
  - 33% Camp 1E
  - 27% Camp 1W

*The FCS reported above refers to food consumed during the 7 days prior to data collection.

% of individuals aged 6 to 59 months (n = 3440) reported as being currently enrolled in any nutrition-feeding program, by type of program**

- BSFP (super cereal plus pack) 63%
- TSFP (RSF pack) 7%
- OTP (RUTF pack) 4%
- None 30%

**respondents could select multiple options

By camp (top 5)***

- 56% Camp 8W
- 52% Camp 2W
- 51% Camp 5
- 51% Camp 26
- 46% Camp 3

***findings may be indicative for some camps
10% of refugee households overall reported paying money or goods in the 6 months prior to data collection as a form of rent.

Camps with the highest proportion of households reporting paying rent to someone in order to live in their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- 95% Camp 25
- 79% Camp 27
- 72% Camp 24
- 63% Camp 23
- 32% Camp 26
- 21% Camp 1E
- 12% Camp 22

% of households reporting firewood use (purchased or self-collected), by camp (upper 4)*

- 52% Camp 8W
- 37% Camp 27
- 35% Camp 24
- 32% Camp 23

*Respondents could select multiple options. This indicator does not imply that households reported exclusively using firewood.
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% of households reporting that members face any physical challenges accessing their shelter

By camp (upper 6):

- 81% Camp 8W
- 67% Camp 11
- 64% Camp 10
- 64% Camp 12
- 62% Camp 6
- 61% Camp 4
12% of refugee households overall reported needing to access surface water for drinking or cooking during the last dry season.

Households who reported this need were highly concentrated in six camps in Teknaf:

- 58% Camp 24
- 54% NRC
- 48% Camp 25
- 47% Camp 27
- 34% Camp 26
- 31% Camp 22

1 in every 5 households in Camps 24, 25, and 27 were using surface water or rainwater collection as a main water source for bathing and washing at the time of data collection (roughly) – which may have important health-related implications.

30% of households overall reported that they faced any challenges accessing markets in the past 4 weeks prior to data collection.

Camps with the highest proportion of households reporting that they faced any challenges accessing markets in the past 4 weeks prior to data collection:

- 58% Camp 24
- 54% NRC
- 48% Camp 25
- 47% Camp 27
In other cases, these gaps in coverage seem to highlight issues of particular concern related to gender dynamics and its potential effects on access to services.
Low attendance rates at educational facilities affect adolescents aged 12 and over, but particularly adolescent girls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male (TLC)</th>
<th>Male (Madrassa)</th>
<th>Female (TLC)</th>
<th>Female (Madrassa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FINDINGS

- Refuge
Of households with a school-aged child or youth (aged 3 – 24) not reported as regularly attending a TLC at least 4 days per week in the 30 days prior to data collection (n = 2729), % reporting education barriers (by gender of respondent)**

- **Marriage**: Female respondent - 33%, Male respondent - 40%
- **Cultural reasons**: Female respondent - 22%, Male respondent - 25%
- **Not useful/age-appropriate**: Female respondent - 19%, Male respondent - 22%
- **Individual is needed to help at home**: Female respondent - 15%, Male respondent - 25%
- **Not enough learning materials**: Female respondent - 6%, Male respondent - 23%

**respondents could select 3 options**
Of individual children born in the 12 months prior to data collection (n = 520), % reporting location of delivery**

% of households reporting who decides where a pregnant woman gives birth

44% of individuals aged 0 – 2 years (n = 1613) were not reported as being breastfed immediately / within an hour of birth

** Findings on location of delivery should be triangulated with health sector data. The recall period was in the past year (children 0-11 months) and not in the past 6 months (children 0 – 6 months)

* Clinic run by government, NGO or private
% of households reporting point-of-contact if they needed to refer a friend who was sexually assaulted for care and support*

- Majhi: 84% (Female: 81%)
- Legal aid providers: 8% (Female: 25%)
- Police and security: 10% (Female: 20%)
- Health center: 8% (Female: 22%)

Female respondents were less likely / able to name other resources / mechanisms of support other than Majhi in the event of sexual assault

% of households reporting who they would report to first if a serious security issue happens, by point-of-contact

- Majhi: 90%
- Camp Management Authorities: 4%
- Army: 3%
- UN or NGO staff: 1%

15% of respondents would refer a friend who was sexually assaulted to health facilities, police and security, or legal aid service providers
% of households reporting on gender norms and freedom of movement for women to go to the local market

**Male respondents**
- Married women:
  - Can go alone: 28%
  - Can go accompanied by someone else: 55%
  - Can never go: 15%
  - Not applicable: 2%

- Unmarried women:
  - Can go alone: 20%
  - Can go accompanied by someone else: 60%
  - Can never go: 15%
  - Not applicable: 5%

**Female respondents**
- Married women:
  - Can go alone: 31%
  - Can go accompanied by someone else: 24%
  - Can never go: 31%
  - Not applicable: 5%

- Unmarried women:
  - Can go alone: 17%
  - Can go accompanied by someone else: 35%
  - Can never go: 33%
  - Not applicable: 15%

**KEY FINDINGS**
- Refugee
While findings point to generally high coverage of basic needs and services, refugees reported the need to seek out additional means beyond humanitarian assistance to cover their needs. Levels of household-level coping extended beyond aid dependency and selling of assistance items.
% of households reporting spending >0 BDT on the following items / services in the month prior to data collection

96% Food
77% Transportation
74% Communication costs
72% Medical expenses
46% Clothing and shoes
41% Festivals or community events**
37% Debt repayment
30% Hygiene items
27% Shelter materials
26% Kitchen items
25% Educational materials

69% of households reporting borrowing money or purchasing items on credit in the 30 days preceding data collection.

This proportion seems to be increasing across different rounds of the MSNA: 35% in July 2018, 45% in January 2019, 69% in August 2019.

Out of all households, most frequently cited reasons for borrowing money or purchasing items on credit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To purchase food</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover health expenses</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To buy clothes or shoes**</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*respondents could select multiple options
**the data collection period included the festival of Eid al-Adha
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% of households engaging in coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs, during the 30 days prior to data collection*

- Borrowed money: 69%
- Selling non-food items provided as assistance: 41%
- Selling, sharing, exchanging food rations: 35%
- Bought items on credit: 34%
- Depending on rations or support as sole food/income source: 20%
- Spent savings: 17%
- Selling labour in advance: 9%
- Movement outside the camp to seek work: 7%
- Accepting risky or illegal temporary jobs: 2%
- None: 5%

*respondents could select multiple options

95% of households reported engaging in coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs, during 30 days prior to data collection
Many refugee households report engaging in coping mechanisms in order to manage health-related issues: including paying for care or even incurring debt to secure treatment.

Among the 80% of households with at least one member with an illness, % reporting using coping mechanisms during the month prior data collection (n = 2,724)*:

- Going into debt to pay for health expenditures: 65% (Female) vs 66% (Male)
- Pay for health care: 63% (Female) vs 52% (Male)
- Home treatment due to lack of money: 6% (Female) vs 19% (Male)
- Seeking lower quality care or medication: 11% (Female) vs 12% (Male)

*respondents could select multiple options
Key findings: Host Community MSNA
Assessment findings suggest that there are similar proportions of households with minimal needs as having extreme gaps, with the majority falling between either extreme. This reflects the socio-economic environment that should underpin considerations of host communities’ needs.
% of households by Food Consumption Score*

- Poor (<28): 4%
- Borderline (28-42): 25%
- Acceptable (>42): 72%

There is minimal geographic variation among Unions when it comes to food security outcomes.

% of households by household dietary diversity**

- 0-2 food groups: 31%
- 3 food groups: 32%
- 4+ food groups: 36%

However, the lack of dietary diversity continues to be a major driver of need.

---

* The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of 9 weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a 7-day recall period.

** The standard module to calculate a Household Dietary Diversity Score (24-hour recall period) was not included in the questionnaire. These findings represent the % of households who reported consuming numbers of food groups at least 6-7 times in a week.
Most host community households reported accessing improved water sources for drinking and cooking.

However, not all households reported sufficient water quantities for all purposes.

% of households reporting having enough water to meet basic needs, by type of need:

- Enough water for **drinking**: 94%
- Enough water for **cooking**: 93%
- Enough water for **personal hygiene**: 87%
- Enough water for **domestic purposes**: 65%

*respondents could select multiple options*
79% of households reported being connected to the electricity grid. Lower proportions of households reported being connected to the electricity in Ukhiya Unions. Of households reporting not being connected to the electricity grid, 55% attributed this to being unable to pay for electricity.*

Of households reporting the presence of at least one individual requiring daily assistance:

- Fewer than 1 in 5 reported being able to access support for this individual.

1. 92% Teknaf Paurashava
2. 89% Sabrang
3. 86% Teknaf Sadar
4. 83% Nhilla
5. 82% Ratna Palong
6. 79% Raja Palong
7. 78% Whykong
8. 75% Baharchhara
9. 74% Jalia Palong
10. 74% Haldia Palong
11. 50% Palong Khali

*The denominator for this indicator is households without electricity (21%) (n = 278)
**KEY FINDINGS – Host Community**

Most households reported owning their land and most households reported owning the house that they are occupying. Only 2% of households reported that they rented their current accommodation. However, findings point potential gaps in regard to perceived security of tenure:

10% of households reported feeling at risk of eviction or being forced to leave their house / shelter in the next few months.

37% of households reported **not making improvements to their shelter** in the 6 months prior to data collection, **despite reporting the need to do so**.

Of households not making improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection (n = 797):

60% stated **lack of enough money** as a reason for not making improvements.*

*Overall, 61% of households reported not making improvements to their shelter. However, a portion of these households reported not making improvements because there was no need to do so. This indicator reflects those households that did not report making any improvements but did report needing to.
Findings did not show significantly worse-off conditions or needs in any given area in the assessed host communities. However, certain indicators demonstrated issues in access to water and education in Teknaf Upazila.
81% of households reported never accessing surface water for drinking or cooking during the last dry season.

Those households who reported needing to were mostly concentrated in Teknaf.

Unions with the highest proportion of households reporting accessing surface water (a couple of times or almost every day) for drinking or cooking during the last dry season:

- Whykong: 35%
- Baharchhara: 30%
- Nhilla: 26%
- Teknaf Sadar: 25%
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% of school-aged children and youth (aged 4 – 24) reported to be attending any formal education opportunities during the current academic year*

30% of households reported the presence of at least one primary or secondary school-aged child (5 – 17) in the household who was not attending any learning opportunities.

Unions with the highest proportion of households reporting the presence of at least one primary or secondary school-aged child who was not attending any learning opportunity were concentrated in Teknaf Upazila.

47% Teknaf Sadar
35% Sabrang
33% Baharchhara
33% Teknaf Paurashava

* Formal education opportunities include government school, Alia madrassa, private school (non-religious), university, technical college, college (public or private), or Ministry of Youth and Sport Development Programmes.
3 Certain findings seem to highlight issues of particular concern related to protection and gender dynamics and its potential effects on access to services in host communities.
### KEY FINDINGS – Host Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting areas in their neighbourhood where male and female members feel unsafe (top 3)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ Market ⬅️ 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ On way to / from key facilities ⬅️ 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ Firewood collection sites ⬅️ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ Markets ⬅️ 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ Latrines ⬅️ 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬅️ On way to / from key facilities ⬅️ 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6% of households reported the presence of a child (<18 years) in the household who is already or is about to get married.

5% of households reported the presence of a child (<18 years) in the household working to earn an income the 30 days prior to data collection.

*respondents could select multiple options
% of households reporting on gender norms and freedom of movement for women to go to the local market

**Male respondents**
- Married women:
  - Can go alone: 18%
  - Can go accompanied by someone: 22%
  - Can never go: 53%
  - Not applicable: 8%

- Unmarried women:
  - Can go alone: 19%
  - Can go accompanied by someone: 9%
  - Can never go: 49%
  - Not applicable: 23%

**Female respondents**
- Married women:
  - Can go alone: 38%
  - Can go accompanied by someone: 12%
  - Can never go: 41%
  - Not applicable: 9%

- Unmarried women:
  - Can go alone: 26%
  - Can go accompanied by someone: 19%
  - Can never go: 38%
  - Not applicable: 18%
Households rely on a diverse range of service providers, often associated with incurred costs. Spending on items and services is underpinned by greater access to livelihoods and participation in income-generating activities, as well as asset ownership. However, MSNA findings show that households are still engaging in coping mechanisms in order to meet basic needs.
A considerable proportion of households report going into debt or purchasing items on credit, often to meet basic needs related to health care and food consumption.

% of households reporting spending >1000 BDT on the following items / services in the month prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical expenses</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking fuel</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and shoes</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational materials</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt repayment</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals or community events*</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen items</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication costs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene items</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56% of households reporting borrowing money or purchasing items on credit in the 30 days preceding data collection.

Out of all households, most frequently cited reasons for borrowing money or purchasing items on credit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To cover health expenses</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To buy food</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pay school, education costs</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the data collection period included the festival of Eid al-Adha

**respondents could select multiple options
98% of individuals reported to have an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the past 30 days prior to data collection sought treatment.

Health seeking behaviour was reported to be high.

Yet, most individuals sought treatment at a private clinic or pharmacy/drug shop.

31% of individuals were reported to have an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection, affecting 81% households overall (gender and age breakdown below).

Of individuals reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection who sought treatment (n = 2236), % by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 4%
- Private clinic: 47%
- Pharmacy / drug shop in market: 48%
- Government clinic: 26%

*respondents could select multiple options.

53% of households reported going into debt to pay for health expenditures as a coping mechanism when at least one individual was reported to have an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection (n = 1059).
The cost of education and education-related materials constitutes an important reason cited for education non-attendance for children and youth in the surveyed host communities.

Of households with a school-aged child or youth (aged 4 – 24) not reported as regularly attending a formal education opportunity during the current academic year (n = 926), % reporting education barriers, by respondent gender*

- **Cost**: Female respondent 31%, Male respondent 37%
- **Individual is needed to contribute to income**: Female respondent 27%, Male respondent 38%
- **Individual is needed to help at home**: Female respondent 25%, Male respondent 28%
- **What is taught is not useful/age-appropriate**: Female respondent 17%, Male respondent 27%
- **Marriage**: Female respondent 11%, Male respondent 24%

*households could select multiple options
While most households report engaging in income-generating activities, the below indicators do not explore important dimensions of informality, decent work, sustainability or stability in employment – which may shed more light on the economic vulnerability of these populations.

86% of households reported the presence of at least one adult (18+) working to earn an income in the past 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting main sources of income (Top 3)*

- Employment / labour: 84%
- Agricultural production and sales (including livestock): 16%
- Remittances from abroad: 9%

**households could select multiple options

% of households reporting main sources of employment (Top 4)**

- Small business: 28%
- Agricultural / casual (e.g. construction, drainage): 18%
- Unskilled wage labour (other construction): 17%
- Non-agricultural casual labour (e.g. tom tom driver): 17%

**households could select multiple options

% of households reporting owning livelihood assets

- Livestock: 50%
- Agricultural land: 24%
- Fishing gear: 13%
% of households reporting engaging in coping mechanisms due to a lack of money to meet basic needs, during the 30 days prior to data collection*

- Borrowed money: 56%
- Bought items on credit: 29%
- Spent savings: 25%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 8%
- Selling productive assets: 8%
- Selling labour in advance: 4%
- Withdrew children from school: 3%
- None: 28%

*respondents could select multiple options

3 in 4 households reported engaging in coping mechanisms due to a lack of money to meet basic needs, during the 30 days prior to data collection
Host community households reported a wide range of priority needs for which they require additional support, with ‘access to food’ ranking the highest.

% of households reporting the priority needs for which they require additional support (top 7, unranked)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Male respondents</th>
<th>Female respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials / upgrades</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to safe and functional latrines</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking fuel</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income generating activities / employment</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health services and / or medicines</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting the priority needs for which they require additional support (top 7, ranked)**

**The ranking findings reflects a Borda Count methodology of 17 priority needs, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position in which each respondent ranks it.

*proportion of households reporting each priority need as a top 3 need, unranked
NEXT STEPS:

- Additional analysis on cross-sectoral needs
- Expect official outputs to be released throughout December
- Consultations with the affected communities to discuss and provide nuance to key findings
Resources and contact information

**Refugee MSNA Questionnaire**
https://www.impact-repository.org/document/reach/ff0d2187/BGD_Questionnaire_In-Depth-Joint-MSNAs_Host-Community_July2019-1.pdf

**Host Community MSNA Questionnaire**

**Refugee clean dataset**

**Host Community clean dataset**