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ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

In successive waves over four decades, Rohingya refugees have been fleeing to Bangladesh from Rakhine State, Myanmar. Since August 2017, an estimated 745,000 Rohingya refugees have arrived in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh, increasing the total number of Rohingya refugees to more than 900,000.1 Most of the newly-arrived refugees have settled in hilly, formerly-forested areas that are vulnerable to landslides and flash-flooding in monsoon season, and rely heavily on humanitarian assistance to cover their basic needs. As the crisis moves beyond the initial emergency phase, comprehensive information on the needs and vulnerabilities of affected populations is needed in order to inform the design and implementation of effective inter-sectoral programming.

To this aim, a Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (J-MSNA) was conducted across Rohingya refugee populations to support humanitarian planning and enhance the ability of operational partners to meet the strategic aims of donors and coordinating bodies. This in-depth assessment is a follow-on to the June 2019 “Light” MSNA, which was used to inform the mid-term review of the humanitarian 2019 Joint Response Plan (JRP).2 The J-MSNA was conducted to inform the Inter Sector Coordination Group (ISCG)’s 2019 Rohingya crisis MSNA Strategy, with the objectives of: (1) providing a comprehensive evidence base of household-level multi-sectoral needs for the 2020 JRP; and (2) providing the basis for joint multi-stakeholder analysis.

A total of 3,418 households were surveyed across 34 refugee sites, employing a simple random sampling methodology of shelter footprints within official site boundaries. Data collection occurred from 5 August through 15 September 2019. Each interview was conducted with an adult household representative responding on behalf of the household and its members. Findings in the factsheet are presented at the overall response level and are generalisable to all Rohingya refugee households living in camps with a 95% confidence level and 3% margin of error. Camp-level findings for indicators where substantial geographical variation was observed are available at the J-MSNA Dashboard. A more detailed methodology, as well as caveats and limitations, may be found in “Background and Methodology”.3

This J-MSNA was funded by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO). The assessment was coordinated through ISCG’s MSNA Technical Working Group (TWG) of the Information Management and Assessment Working Group (IMAWG), led by ISCG and comprised of: UNHCR, International Organization for Migration Needs and Population Monitoring (IOM NPM), ACAPS, World Food Programme Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (WFP VAM), Translators without Borders (TWB), and REACH.

3 The full terms of reference for the assessment may be found at: ISCG, Assessment Concept Note, Rohingya Crisis Bangladesh, In-Depth MSNA, July 2019 (Cox’s Bazar, 2019). Available here (accessed 19 November 2019).

1 The proportion of female-headed households in this assessment is lower than the rates reported in other assessments (usually constituting roughly one-quarter of all refugee households). This may be explained in part by the definition of "head of household" that was provided to respondents: "the individual who makes decisions on behalf of the entire household", irrespective of the name or number of people included on their registration card.
**BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY**

- **J-MSNA framework**: The analytical framework for multi-sector analysis is based on the work undertaken by the Joint Inter-sector Analysis Group (JIAG), tailored by ACAPS and other participants of the MSNA TWG to meet the specific needs of the Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis. The focus of the J-MSNA is to measure current humanitarian conditions, perceptions and preferences, and safety and security. The J-MSNA is not intended to capture information on natural or man-made hazards, legal or rights-based issues, logistics or humanitarian access. It is also not intended to inform long-term development programming.

- **Assessment design**: Indicator identification and tool development were conducted in close consultation with all sectors, as well as various working groups and experts present in the response. These indicators and the overall tool were then finalised by the MSNA TWG.

- **Sampling strategy and household selection**: Target sample sizes for each camp were based on the most recent population figures available from UNHCR. ISCG camp boundaries were overlaid onto REACH/UNOSAT shelter footprint data. A random distribution of GPS points was then generated, with each GPS point indicating a shelter to be approached for an interview. Additional buffer points were sampled to account for instances of non-eligibility or non-response. To ensure that the experiences and perspectives of both males and females were equally represented in the assessment, enumerator teams were composed equally (50:50) of men and women, with each enumerator interviewing an adult respondent of their own gender, who was most knowledgeable about affairs of the household (as defined by the household).

- **Data collection**: The J-MSNA was conducted from 5 August through 15 September 2019. Enumerators underwent a three-day training and a two-day pilot in order to familiarise themselves with the tool, field protocols, as well as the code of conduct and basic protection principles. Representatives of all sectors directly trained enumerators. During data collection, informed consent was sought, received and documented at the start of each interview.

- **Data cleaning and checking**: Each day, data checking and cleaning was conducted according to a set of pre-established standard operating procedures, with checks including outlier checks, correct categorisation of "other" responses, and the removal and/or replacement of incomplete or inaccurate records. All changes to the dataset were documented in a cleaning log.

**CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS**

- **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 may not directly reflect the realities of service provision or security conditions in refugee camps - only on individuals’ perceptions of them.

- **Limitations of household surveys**: While household-level quantitative surveys seek to provide quantifiable information that can be generalised to 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, or reasons for incurring debt, gender dynamics, etc.) are best suited to be explored through an accompanying qualitative component. The unit of measurement for this assessment was the household, and therefore does not focus on intra-household dynamics (including in relation to intra-household gender roles, norms and dynamics; disability; age, etc.). Users are reminded to supplement and triangulate findings from this survey with other data sources.

- **Subset indicators**: Findings that refer to a subset (of the overall population) may have a lower confidence interval and a wider margin of error. For example, questions asked only to households with school-aged children, or to households with at least one individual reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment, will yield results with lower precision. Any findings that refer to a subset are noted in this factsheet.

- **Timing of assessment**: When interpreting findings, users are informed that data collection was: (1) conducted during monsoon season; (2) included the festival of Eid-al-Adha; and (3) occurred at the same time as other events such as the commemoration of the anniversary of the events of 2017.

---

5 "No formal education" includes "none" and "madrassa only"; "Some primary" includes "Kindergarten" through "Elementary 4"; "Primary and above" includes "Elementary 5" through tertiary levels.

6 Questions on household disability prevalence were not asked according to Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability. Respondents were asked to report on each individual in their household who required another person to help them / her complete daily activities such as eating, dressing, bathing or going to the toilet.

7 JIAG is developing an analytical framework for inter-sectoral analysis, assisting with the identification of inter-linkages between various drivers, underlying and contributing factors, sectors and humanitarian conditions.
**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES (CWC) AND PRIORITY NEEDS**

### PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting the priority needs for which they require additional support, by respondent gender (top 4, unranked)\(^{8,9}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Need</th>
<th>Female Respondents</th>
<th>Male Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials / upgrades</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (solar, battery)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income-generating activities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Female respondents**
- **Male respondents**

Top 4 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score\(^{8,10}\)

1. Access to food: 1.37
2. Shelter materials / upgrades: 0.89
3. Electricity (solar, battery): 0.68
4. Access to income-generating activities: 0.32

A higher value in the table of ranked priority needs (bottom left) indicates that respondents prioritised this intervention above others. The maximum value possible was three. Although the top three priority needs (food, shelter materials and electricity) were reported by similar proportions of households, the ranking of these needs (bottom left) highlights the relative importance of these interventions. "Access to food" features significantly higher than other stated needs. There is minimum variation in stated needs when disaggregated based on respondent gender. "Access to clean drinking water" rounded out the top five, albeit ranking considerably lower than those reported in the bottom left corner.

### PREFERRED AID MODALITIES

Of households reporting different priority needs, % reporting preferred modalities of assistance to meet each need\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household / clothing</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS

- **22%** of households reported facing any barriers to interacting with humanitarian workers
- **Three most frequently reported barriers**
  - Language: 11%
  - Do not understand the terms: 10%
  - Humanitarian workers are rude or disrespectful: 3%

---

\(^1\) Respondents were asked to report the top three priority needs for which their family required additional support, and then rank the 3 identified needs in order of importance.

\(^2\) This figure presents the proportion of households that named each option as a top three priority need, regardless of rank.

\(^3\) Rankings were analysed according to the Borda Count methodology, 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. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, #2 need scored two points, and #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all respondents, providing a score out of a maximum of three.

\(^4\) Respondents were asked their preferred modality to receive these items if they reported any of them as a top three priority need. Respondents could only choose one modality of assistance. The denominator for each indicator is as follows: Food, n = 1,796; Shelter materials, n = 1,569; Household/clothing items, n = 688; Fuel, n = 212. Roughly 1-2% of households reported either a "combination" or "no preference" of modalities for each type of need.
% of households reporting how frequently they felt that their opinion was taken into account when providing feedback on aid and services received:

- Always: 38%
- Sometimes: 38%
- Rarely: 12%
- Never: 11%
- Prefer not to answer: 1%

% of households reporting what is **not going well** with assistance and services received in the 6 months prior to data collection (top 7):

- Poor or insufficient shelter materials: 36%
- Insufficient access to income sources: 29%
- Insufficient/not diverse enough foods: 25%
- Insufficient camp infrastructure: 22%
- Health services insufficient/poor quality: 20%
- Insufficient access to clean water: 20%
- Insufficient cooking fuel (LPG, etc.): 16%

% of households reporting what is **going well** with assistance and services received in the 6 months prior to data collection (top 7):

- No need to collect firewood anymore: 52%
- Structural improvements in camps: 47%
- Improved sanitation in camps: 37%
- Improved access to clean water: 31%
- Stronger shelter materials: 26%
- Better or more diverse food: 19%
- More trainings from NGOs: 18%

---

13 For both questions, respondents could choose up to three options.
FOOD SECURITY

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score (FCS)\textsuperscript{14}

- **5\%** Poor
- **41\%** Borderline
- **54\%** Acceptable

% of households by estimated household dietary diversity\textsuperscript{15}

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

FOOD SOURCES

% of households reporting the three main sources of food consumed in the 7 days prior to data collection\textsuperscript{16}

- **Purchase (cash)** 73\%
- **Food assistance (distribution/in-kind)** 51\%
- **Food assistance (food card/e-voucher)** 44\%
- **Borrowing** 25\%
- **Support from relatives/friends** 14\%
- **Barter and exchange** 7\%
- **Army distributing food** 5\%
- **Own production/vegetable garden** 1\%

Overall FCSs suggest that access to basic foods is extensive, and not indicative of widespread extreme gaps in food consumption patterns. "Poor" FCSs - represented by diets of poor quality and quantity (mainly rice and fats, and certain greens)\textsuperscript{19} - were not found to exceed nine per cent of households in any camp. However, a significant proportion of households continue to endure "borderline" food consumption outcomes. Estimates of household dietary diversity based on the reported quantity of food groups consumed during the seven days prior to data collection also suggest that the majority of refugee families face difficulties accessing a varied diet. Roughly three-quarters of households are estimated to consume three food groups or fewer in any given day. These outcomes should also be interpreted in conjunction with any additional coping strategies that refugees may employ beyond basic humanitarian assistance in order to meet basic needs, which may include sale of assistance items or incurring debt, as well as other more extreme mechanisms (see p.11 for further exploration). Most refugee households reported obtaining food through a combination of assistance from humanitarian actors and purchasing in cash. The above results reflect a continuation of conditions reported in the 2018 Refugee influx Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA II).\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} The Food Consumption Score is a composite score based on: (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: \(\geq 42\) Acceptable; 28 - 41 Borderline; \(\leq 27\) Poor.

\textsuperscript{15} 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 six or seven times in a week.

\textsuperscript{16} Respondents could choose up to three options.

\textsuperscript{17} BDT - Bangladeshi Taka

\textsuperscript{18} 1\% of respondents reported "do not know / prefer not to answer"; 4\% reported spending 0 BDT on food expenses in the 30 days prior to data collection.

ACCESS TO MARKETS

% of households reporting length of time it takes to travel to the closest market by foot (in minutes)

- 7% <5 minutes
- 36% 16 - 30 minutes
- 41% 5 - 15 minutes
- 16% >30 minutes

% of households reporting spending any money (>0 BDT) on transportation in the 30 days prior to data collection

- 77%

30% of households reported problems accessing markets in the 30 days prior to data collection

Most frequently reported problems

- Markets are too far: 18%
- Bad roads due to traffic/rough weather: 8%
- Transport is too expensive: 8%
- Safety/security concerns on the way to the market: 5%
- Safety/security concerns at the market: 3%

BDT - Bangladeshi Taka.
Respondents could choose up to three options.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

WATER SOURCES

% of households reporting main source(s) of water used for the following purposes at the time of data collection\(^22\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drinking and cooking</th>
<th>Bathing and washing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>76%</strong> Tube wells/boreholes/hand pump</td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29%</strong> Piped water tap/tap stand into settlement site</td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2%</strong> Rainwater collection</td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2%</strong> Cart with small tank or drum</td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong> Protected dug well</td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong> Surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, canals)</td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong> Unprotected dug well</td>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong> Unprotected spring</td>
<td><strong>&lt;1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improved drinking water source\(^23\)
- Unimproved drinking water source

% of households reporting frequency of accessing surface water for drinking or cooking purposes during the last dry season\(^24\)

- 88% Never
- 8% A couple of times
- 3% Almost every day
- 1% Do not know

WATER COLLECTION

% of households reporting collection times for water (fetch and return)

- 31% <5 minutes
- 43% 5 - 15 minutes
- 16% 16 - 30 minutes
- 10% >30 minutes

WATER QUANTITIES

% of households reporting having enough water to meet the following basic needs at the time of data collection\(^25\)

- Drinking: 87%
- Personal hygiene: 83%
- Cooking: 90%
- Other domestic purposes: 49%

Ninety-nine per cent (99%) of refugee households reported accessing improved water sources as their main source of water for drinking and cooking purposes. This reflects similar findings from WASH Sector assessments conducted in May of 2019\(^26\) and October 2018\(^27\) (with data collection for the latter assessment also occurring during monsoon season). However, water originating from improved water sources and/or spouts may still be contaminated, with significant pollution of drinking water also occurring at the household level (related to hygiene and storage practices)\(^28\). Findings from this assessment indicate that not all households had enough water to meet basic needs during monsoon season. Eleven per cent (11%) of households also reported the need to access surface water for drinking or cooking purposes either some days or almost every day during the last dry season. Most households reporting the need to do so were concentrated in six camps in southern Teknaf (Camps 22, 24, 25, 26, 27 and Nayapara RC).

\(^{22}\) Respondents could choose more than one option.

\(^{23}\) An "improved drinking-water source" is one "that by the nature of its construction adequately protects the source from outside contamination, in particular with faecal matter" (World Health Organization, Key Terms - Water sanitation hygiene (Geneva, n.d.). Available [here](https://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/keyterms))

\(^{24}\) Respondents were asked to recall frequencies from the previous dry season, as data collection occurred during the rainy season. The calendar period corresponding to "dry season" was not specifically defined but is commonly understood to include the months immediately preceding monsoon season (roughly April - May 2019).

\(^{25}\) “Personal hygiene” includes activities such as washing and bathing; “other domestic purposes” includes activities such as cleaning house, floor, etc.


SANITATION & HYGIENE

% of households reporting types of sanitation facility (latrine or toilet) usually used

- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 60%
- Pour or flush household latrine: 33%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 6%

% of households that reported having soap: 67%

% of households reporting on visible traces of environmental sanitation issues in the vicinity of their accommodation (30 metres) in the 30 days prior to data collection

- Waste: 39%
- Human faeces: 26%
- Stagnant water: 16%

% of households reported spending any money (>0 BDT) on hygiene items in the 30 days prior to data collection: 30%

---

29 An "improved sanitation facility" is one which "hygienically separates human excreta from human contact". Classification of latrines in the present assessment is based on WHO/UNICEF guidelines. (World Health Organization, Key Terms - Water sanitation hygiene (Geneva, n.d.). Available [here](accessed 30 November 2019).

30 BDT - Bangladeshi Taka.
HEALTH AND NUTRITION

WELLBEING

80% of households reported the presence of at least one person with an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection.

35% of individuals were reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Of individuals reported as having an illness, % by age range

- 0 - 17: 31%
- 18 - 59: 36%
- 60+: 70%

Of individuals reported as having an illness, % by gender

- Male: 32%
- Female: 38%

% of households reporting at least one member ill with diarrhoea in the 2 weeks prior to data collection

31%

22% reported the presence of at least one individual under 5 years of age with diarrhea.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOURS

Of individuals reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment, % for whom treatment was sought

97%

Of individuals reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment who sought treatment, % by treatment location

- NGO clinic: 79%
- Private clinic: 29%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 22%
- Government clinic: 8%
- Traditional / community healer: 3%

31 Data on individual illness and disability were collected by proxies (from respondents on behalf of all household members), and not directly from household members themselves.

32 Questions on household disability prevalence were not asked according to Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability. Respondents were asked to report on each individual in their household who required another person to help him / her complete daily activities such as eating, dressing, bathing or going to the toilet.

33 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals in the specified age groups (0 - 17, n = 5,870; 18 - 59, n = 7,571; 60 and above, n = 648). The recall period is in the 30 days prior to data collection.

34 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals of either gender (males, n = 8,559; females, n = 8,602). The recall period is in the 30 days prior to data collection.

35 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals aged five and above (n = 14,089).

36 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals aged 60 and above (n = 648). The recall period is in the 30 days prior to data collection.

37 The denominator for this indicator is all households with children under five (n = 2,021);

38 The denominator for this indicator is all households with individuals aged five and above (n = 3,418).

39 The denominator for this indicator is all households who reported the presence of at least one individual (aged 5 and above) reported as requiring assistance to complete daily activities (n = 1,549).

40 Respondents could report more than one treatment location. The denominator for this indicator is individuals who were reported to have had an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection, who sought treatment (n = 5,771).
ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

Of the 3% of individuals reported as having an illness serious enough to require medical treatment who did not seek treatment, most-frequently reported reasons for not seeking treatment

- Health services overcrowded (long wait times)
- Treatment not available
- Treatment is expensive
- Health service staff behaviour is bad
- Health services are too far away / lack of transport

Of households reporting at least one member (aged 5 and above) requiring assistance to complete daily activities, % reporting that they were able to access support for this individual.

The proportion of individuals reported to have sought treatment at an NGO clinic or Government clinic has remained consistent over MSNA data from January 2019 and July 2018. However, the proportion of individuals reported to have sought treatment at a private clinic or pharmacy / drug shop has increased by ten percentage points for both compared with January 2019. Reported treatment location did not vary significantly by camp. Male respondents (52%) were more likely to report having been visited by a community health worker in the two weeks prior to data collection than female respondents (38%).

Findings from the J-MSNA indicate that nearly three-quarters of households reported accessing support for individual(s) requiring assistance to complete daily activities. However, findings from Rounds III (May 2019) and IV (October 2019) of the WASH Household Surveys, in which the question regarding accessing support services was asked of each individual reported as having a disability (per Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability), roughly one-third of individuals reported to have a disability were reported to have accessed support, in both rounds.

MATERNAL, NEWBORN AND CHILD HEALTH

9% of households reported the presence of a pregnant woman

% of all households reporting primary decision-maker on location of delivery of child

82% At home
18% At a clinic

Of children aged 0 to 11 months, % by reported location of delivery

53% Husband of the pregnant woman
14% Other relative of the pregnant woman
13% Pregnant woman herself
10% Joint decision between pregnant woman and someone else
9% Do not know / prefer not to answer
1% Community leader

44% of households reported being visited by a community health worker during the two weeks prior to data collection
Of individuals aged 0 to 2 years at the time of data collection, % who were reported to have been breastfed immediately / within an hour of birth\(^48\)

Of households reporting the presence of at least one mother with a child aged 0 to 2 years, % reporting ever receiving support on feeding young children\(^49\)

Of individuals aged 6 to 59 months, % reported as being currently enrolled in any nutrition-feeding programme, by type of programme\(^50\)

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{Programme} & \text{BSFP} & \text{TSFP} & \text{OTP} & \text{None} \\ \hline \text{63%} & \text{7%} & \text{4%} & \text{30%} \\ \end{array} \]

**HEALTH COPING MECHANISMS**

Of the 80% of households reporting the presence of at least one member with an illness in the 30 days prior to data collection, % reporting using coping mechanisms for health-related issues (top 4)\(^51\)

\[ \begin{array}{c|c} \text{Coping Mechanism} & \text{Percentage} \\ \hline \text{Went into debt to pay for health expenditures} & 66\% \\ \text{Paid for health care} & 57\% \\ \text{Home treatment due to lack of money} & 13\% \\ \text{Sought lower-quality care or medication} & 12\% \\ \end{array} \]

**HEALTH EXPENDITURES**

% of households reporting amount spent (BDT)\(^52\) on medical expenses, health care, and/or medicine in the 30 days prior to data collection

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{Amount Spent} & \text{None} & \text{1 - 500} & \text{501 - 1000} & \text{1001 - 2000} & \text{2001 - 2000} & \text{5000+} \\ \hline \text{28%} & \text{20%} & \text{21%} & \text{17%} & \text{9%} & \text{5%} \\ \end{array} \]

Findings from this J-MSNA indicate that a majority of children born in the year leading up to data collection were born at home. These findings do not specify whether births were attended by a skilled or unskilled birth attendant (e.g. midwife). The reported primary decision-maker on location of delivery of children did not vary based on respondent gender. Of those households reporting the presence of at least one mother with a child aged zero to two years that did report receiving support on feeding young children, 20% reported receiving support at home, and 18% at a facility. Of those households reporting at least one pregnant woman enrolled in an ANC programme (n = 218), the majority (87%) reported receiving an ANC card.

\[^48\] The denominator for this indicator is all individuals aged 0-2 years of age (n = 1,613). Respondents were asked how long after birth each child within this age range was put to the breast, and could only choose one option from "within one hour", "in the first day", "after the first day", or "do not know".

\[^49\] The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one mother with a child aged 0-2 years (n = 1,382). Respondents were asked whether mothers received support on feeding young children at home, at a facility, or not at all.

\[^50\] Respondents could choose more than one option. The denominator for this indicator is all individuals aged 6 to 59 months (n = 3,440). BSFP = "blanket supplementary feeding programme"; TSFP = "targeted supplementary feeding programme"; OTP = "outpatient therapeutic programme".

\[^51\] Respondents could choose more than one option. The denominator for this indicator is all individuals who were reported to have had an illness serious enough to require medical treatment in the 30 days prior to data collection (n = 5,967).

\[^52\] BDT - Bangladeshi Taka.
PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY

Of female respondents reported at least one area in their neighbourhood where female members do not feel safe 45%.

Of male respondents reported at least one area in their neighbourhood where male members do not feel safe 33%.

### Female members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</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>
<tr>
<td>Distribution points</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centres</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Male members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</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>
<tr>
<td>Distribution points</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside the home</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the way to or from key facilities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently reported areas (top 6):

1. Market (18%)
2. Latrines (15%)
3. Shelter (8%)
4. Distribution points (6%)
5. Inside the home (6%)
6. On the way to or from key facilities (5%)

Most frequently reported reasons (top 5):

1. Fear of abduction (61%)
2. Lack of enough light at night (33%)
3. Fear of criminal groups (30%)
4. Violence (28%)
5. Petty crime, bullying, harassment (24%)

While bathing areas were frequently reported as an area where female members felt unsafe in the July 2018 MSNA (34%; within the top three), a very low proportion of female respondents reported bathing areas in the present assessment. This may be linked to more women choosing to bathe at home, as shown in the recent WASH household assessment (October 2019).
REPORTING SAFETY CONCERNS

% of households reporting preferred point-of-contact if they needed to refer a friend who was sexually assaulted for care and support57

- Majhi: 84% (81%)
- Legal aid service providers: 8% (25%)
- Police and security: 10% (20%)
- Health facilities: 8% (22%)
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 5% (17%)
- Psychosocial service providers: 6% (6%)

Female respondents: 84% (81%)
Male respondents: 81% (81%)

% of households reporting who they would report to first in the event of a serious security issue, by point-of-contact58

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

The proportion of households citing Majhi as first point-of-contact to report a security issue remained consistent with MSNA data from July 2018 and January 2019. Findings regarding point-of-contact for referral in the event of sexual assault show that while most male and female respondents would report to Majhi as first point-of-contact, female respondents were less likely / able to name other resources or mechanisms of support.

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT FOR WOMEN

% of households reporting whether married and unmarried women (aged 18 and over) are allowed to go to the market - accompanied, unaccompanied, or not at all59

Married women

- Male respondents:
  - Can go alone: 28%
  - Can go if accompanied: 56%
  - Can never go: 15%
  - Prefer not to answer: 2%

- Female respondents:
  - Can go alone: 31%
  - Can go if accompanied: 40%
  - Can never go: 24%
  - Prefer not to answer: 5%

Unmarried women

- Male respondents:
  - Can go alone: 15%
  - Can go if accompanied: 60%
  - Can never go: 20%
  - Prefer not to answer: 5%

- Female respondents:
  - Can go alone: 15%
  - Can go if accompanied: 33%
  - Can never go: 35%
  - Prefer not to answer: 17%

Unmarried women were less likely to be reported to be able to go to the market than married women. Female respondents were more likely than male respondents to report women as never being permitted to go to the market (either accompanied or unaccompanied). Male respondents were more likely than female respondents to report that women (married and unmarried) are allowed to go to the market, if accompanied by someone else.

CHILD PROTECTION

5% of households reported the presence of at least one child (17 and under) working to earn an income in the 30 days prior to data collection

5% of households reported that at least one member under the age of 18 who is already married or is about to get married60

2% of households were found to have at least one unaccompanied or separated child61

---

57 Respondents could choose more than one option. This question asked the respondent to answer based on a hypothetical scenario.
58 Majhis are selected by the Government of Bangladesh to support camp management authorities and act as the focal point for an unofficial “block” of households. Majhis were appointed without a formalised process. The system was introduced in registered camps after the 1991-92 influx and revived after the onset of the recent crisis [ACAPS NPM Analysis Hub, Rohingya Crisis: Governance and community participation, thematic report, June 2018 (Cox’s Bazar, 2018). Available here (accessed 1 December 2019)].
59 This question was only asked of households with at least one female individual over the age of 12 (n = 3,391).
60 The denominator for this indicator is all households with at least one member between five years and 17 years of age (n = 3,067).
61 Households were classified as containing unaccompanied or separated children if they reported the presence of individuals under 18 who had joined the household since arriving to Bangladesh, excluding children who were born into the household.
Education attendance rates dropped significantly for both adolescent boys and girls from age 12 onward, albeit decreasing more rapidly for girls than for boys. Adolescent boys aged 12 - 18 were more likely to be reported as regularly attending madrassa than a TLC, while attendance rates for girls aged 12 - 18 were similarly low regardless of the type of learning space. These findings reflect similar conclusions from the Education Needs Assessment conducted in March 2019 (ENA). The aforementioned assessment noted through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) that non-attendance of adolescent girls was closely linked to cultural practices and separation of boys and girls after puberty. These dynamics may be reflected in the above figure, which shows "cultural reasons" and "marriage" as the most frequently-reported reasons for non-attendance of children. This is followed by "what is taught is not useful or age appropriate", which may reflect frustrations voiced in ENA FGDs regarding perceptions that the current curriculum offered is not adequate for more advanced or older learners. The top education barriers reported above also mirror those reported in the ENA. Compared with the July 2018 MSNA, attendance rates at TLCs have increased. For example, 64% of boys and 63% of girls aged 6 - 14 were reported as regularly attending a TLC during the 2018 MSNA, compared with 76% of boys and 71% of girls aged 6 - 14 during the present assessment.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFI)

SHELTER STRUCTURE & MAINTENANCE

- **81%** of households reported facing any issues with their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.
- Issues reported by households:
  - Leaking roof: 71%
  - Rotten/damaged bamboo: 46%
  - Leaking walls: 43%
  - Too small of space: 6%
  - Wet floor: 6%
  - Lack of privacy inside shelter: 3%
  - No lock for door: 1%

- **54%** of households reported having made any improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.
- Most frequently-reported improvements:
  - Replaced the roofing material: 44%
  - Replaced bamboo: 31%
  - Replaced walling material: 26%
  - Cement floor: 9%
  - Increased the size: 3%
  - Installed bathing space: 2%

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

- **65%** of households reporting not making improvements to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection, % reporting lack of enough money as a reason for not making improvements.

SHELTER ACCESS

- **51%** of households reported that members face any physical challenges accessing their shelter at the time of data collection.
- Reasons for inaccessibility reported by households:
  - Pathway too steep: 29%
  - Shelter located on hilltop: 22%
  - Pathway is damaged: 21%
  - Drain on the way to shelter: 10%

---

---
SHelter REnt PaYments

% of households reporting that they have paid money or goods to anyone to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection  

10%

As a proxy for security of land tenure, households were asked whether they had paid rent in the form of goods or direct cash in the six months prior to data collection. While most households reported not paying rent, those reporting the need to do so were concentrated in certain Teknaf camps (excluding Nayapara RC). The proportion of households overall, as well as the localities with higher proportions of households reporting paying money or goods to live in their shelter, closely align with findings from the July 2018 MSNA.

COOKING FUEL

88%  
of households reported exclusively using LPG (cooking gas cylinder) as a fuel source in the 4 weeks prior to data collection

11%  
of households reported using purchased firewood as a fuel source in the 4 weeks prior to data collection

2%  
of households reported using self-collected firewood as a fuel source in the 4 weeks prior to data collection

The proportion of households that reported exclusively using liquid propane gas (LPG) for cooking has increased over a short period of time, from 75% of households in the June 2019 Light MSNA\(^2\) to 88% in August-September during the present assessment. Only 12% of households reported using any type of firewood (either purchased or self-collected) in the four weeks prior to data collection during the current J-MSNA. Of the households indicating using self-collected firewood as a fuel source \((n = 79)\), most reported that adult males were the primary gatherers. "No need to collect firewood anymore" was the most frequently-reported aspect of what was going well with assistance and services received by refugee households in the six months prior to data collection.

OTHER NON-FOOD ITEMS

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

- 40% None
- 40% One lamp
- 20% Two or more

15%  
of households were found to have at least one floor mat per household member\(^3\)

52%  
of households were found to have at least one blanket per household member\(^3\)

EXPENDITURES RELATED TO SHELTER & NFI

% of households that reported spending any money (>0 BDT)\(^4\) on the following items in the 30 days prior to data collection

- Shelter materials (e.g. plastic rope, wire, tarpaulin, cement, bamboo)  27%
- Cooking fuel  16%
- Clothing and shoes\(^5\)  46%
- Kitchen items and utensils  26%

\(\text{1} \) Respondents could choose more than one option.
\(\text{3} \) These indicators were both calculated by comparing the reported number of floor mats / blankets to the reported household size.
\(\text{4} \) BDT – Bangladeshi Taka.
\(\text{5} \) The data collection period included the festival of Eid al-Adha, which may explain the expenditures on clothes/shoes.
of households reported engaging in coping mechanisms due to a lack of money to meet basic needs during the 30 days prior to data collection. 

- Borrowed money: 68%
- Sold non-food items that were provided as assistance: 41%
- Sold, shared and/or exchanged food rations: 35%
- Bought items on credit: 34%
- Depended on community support as only food/income source: 20%
- Spent savings: 17%
- Sold jewelry / gold: 11%
- Sold labour in advance: 9%
- Reduced essential non-food expenditures (e.g. education/health/clothes): 7%
- Movement to areas outside the camp to seek work: 7%
- Sold household goods (e.g. radio/furniture/clothes/kitchen items etc.): 2%
- Reduced expenses on agricultural, livestock, or fisheries inputs: 2%
- Accepted high risk or illegal temporary job: 2%
- Begging: 1%
- Withdrew children from school: 1%
- Adults (18+) worked long hours (>43 hours) or in hazardous conditions: 1%

Understanding the mechanisms that households employ in order to adapt to recent crises provides insights into the difficulties of their situation, and how likely they will be able to meet challenges in the future. The options highlighted in red indicate “crisis” or “emergency” coping mechanisms. These are coping mechanisms which may have long-term (potentially irreversible) negative impacts on individual safety and/or wellbeing.

% of households reporting reasons for borrowing money or purchasing items on credit (i.e. incurring debt) (top 6)

- To buy food: 57%
- To cover health expenses: 55%
- To buy clothes or shoes: 13%
- To repair or build shelter: 5%
- To pay school/education costs: 4%
- To pay house rent: 2%

37% of households reported spending any money (>0 BDT) on debt repayment during the 30 days prior to data collection.

While J-MSNA findings point to generally high coverage of basic needs and services, refugees reported the need to seek out additional means beyond humanitarian assistance in order to cover their basic needs. Only 5% of households reported not engaging in any coping mechanisms due to a lack of income to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection. Levels of household-level coping extended beyond aid dependency and selling of assistance items. Nearly seven out of ten refugee households reported borrowing money, most frequently to meet basic survival needs related to food consumption and health. The proportion of households reporting incurring new debts (borrowing money or purchasing items on credit) also appears to be increasing across different rounds of the MSNA, from 35% in the July 2018 MSNA, to 45% in the January 2019 MSNA, to 69% during the current round. Information gaps persist regarding who the holders of this debt are, from whom money is being borrowed, and the associated risks that may permeate this informal system. There are also indications that the rate at which debt is being incurred outpaces the rate at which households are repaying debts or paying off credit, with only 37% of households reporting repaying debts in the 30 days prior to data collection. This raises additional questions about how long refugee households will continue to be able to live off of credit while avoiding negative outcomes.

76 Respondents were asked whether anyone in the household engaged in each of the reported behaviours due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

77 This question was only asked to households who had indicated borrowing money and/or purchasing items on credit when asked about coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection (n = 2,239). However, findings are presented as a proportion of all households. Respondents could choose more than one option.

78 The data collection period included the festival of Eid al-Adha, which may provide explanation for debt incurred to buy clothes/shoes.

79 BDT - Bangladeshi Taka.
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