CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY
Since the conflict in Ar-Raqqa city ended in October 2017, access to the city and the governorate has increased, however, remains challenging due to the prevalence of unexploded ordnance. The removal of contaminated soil in Ar-Raqqa governorate started in June 2018, but significant challenges persist. Displacement in the governorate is likely to be protracted as individuals return to their community origin, regardless of the security challenges.

To provide up-to-date information on shelter conditions and NFI availability and affordability across northern Syria, REACH conducted an assessment on behalf of the Shelter and NFI Cluster and in partnerships with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Findings presented in this factsheet are based on data collected between 24 June and 2 August 2018 from a total of 819 households across 89 communities and 7 sub-districts in Ar-Raqqa governorate. Households were sampled to allow findings to be generalisable with a 95% level of confidence and margin of error at the regional level. This factsheet also refers to data from a similar assessment from July 2017 in order to highlight significant trends.

KEY FINDINGS
This assessment found that a high proportion of Spontaneous returnees’ (SRs) last place of departure was within Ar-Raqqa governorate (92%). 90% of SR households in the governorate reported property ownership as the primary reason for returning to their community of origin. IDP households in Ar-Raqqa commonly reported shelter adequacy issues such as a lack of bathing facilities (34%) and the inability to lock their shelter securely (21%). The majority of households (64%) reported shelter damage, with 46% of households reportedly unable to make repairs. 87% of households reported adopting coping strategies to cope with the lack of access to NFIs, while 64% of households in Ar-Raqqa reportedly received no information about NFI support in the past year.

DEMOGRAPHICS
Estimated total population across the region: 869,808 individuals
Estimated population of assessed sub-districts: 710,576 individuals
Average household size: 7.5 people

Population distribution by gender and age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-17</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-reported displacement status of households:

- 83% Resident population
- 13% IDPs
- 4% Spontaneous returnees

DISPLACEMENT
Average number of times IDP households have been displaced before arriving in current location: 2.3

Average length of time since IDP households arrived in their current location: 10.3 months

For the 13% of IDP households, top 3 reasons for moving to their current location:

- The place of origin is unsafe: 69%
- Feel safer in this location than in other places: 29%
- No money to go to other locations: 21%

For the 4% of spontaneous returnee households, top 2 reasons for returning to areas of origin:

- Own house/ property in this community: 80%
- Family ties: 11%

41% of IDP households intended to leave their current location within the next month, with intended destinations as follows:

- 71% Return to place of origin
- 16% Different shelter in the same community
- 7% Different community in another governorate
- 6% Not sure

For these 41% of IDP households, top 3 reasons for intending to leave current location:

1. Improve access to income and employment
2. Access to better shelter
3. Proximity to friends/ relatives

1% of spontaneous returnee households intended to leave their current location within the next month. 100% of households reported they would move to a different shelter in the same community.

For these 1% of spontaneous returnee households, 100% of households reported it was due to cheaper rent or housing prices.
Shelter and NFI Assessment: Ar-Raqqa (Household Surveys)

### SHELTER

**Average number of individuals per bedroom:** 5.2

**Percentage of households living in each shelter type:**
- Solid finished house: 62%
- Solid finished apartment: 22%
- Unfinished building: 8%
- Damaged house: 7%
- Collective shelter: 1%

**Percentage of households living in each occupancy arrangement:**
- Ownership: 81%
- Renting: 10%
- Hosted: 8%
- No formal occupancy arrangement: 1%

**Average monthly rent (over three months preceding data collection):** 66 USD (July 2017: 30.5 USD)

12% of households reportedly rented their shelter. Change in rental price (in the three months preceding data collection):
- 7% Stayed the same
- 2% Decreased
- 91% Increased

Of these 12%, ability to pay rent on time (in the three months preceding data collection):
- 76% Paid on time or almost on time
- 11% Missed a rent payment
- 9% Partially
- 4% Miss multiple rent payments

### SHELTER ADEQUACY/DAMAGE

54% of households reported shelter adequacy issues. Of those, top 5 issues:
- Lack of bathing facilities: 34%
- Unable to lock securely: 21%
- Lack of space inside shelter: 15%
- Lack of toilets: 13%
- Lack of lighting around the shelter: 12%

64% of households reported shelter damage. Of those, the top 5 issues:
- Some cracks in some walls: 33%
- Doors/ windows missing: 31%
- Broken or cracked windows: 30%
- Doors unable to shut properly: 25%
- Damaged floors: 14%

### SHELTER REPAIR AND SUPPORT

Of the 64% of households reporting shelter damage, 46% were unable to conduct repairs in the three months preceding data collection. Of those, top 3 reasons:
- Shelter and repair materials were too expensive: 36%
- Repairs require professionals, but services were unaffordable: 14%
- Other: 5%

Top 3 reported unavailable or unaffordable shelter repair materials:
- Cement: 31%
- Doors/ windows: 31%
- Sand/ gravel: 24%

Reported preference for shelter support:
- Unconditional cash support: 69%
- External actor to directly assist with repairs: 17%
- No preference: 11%
- Shelter repair materials: %

64% of households reportedly received no information about shelter support in the last year.

Of the 24% of households reportedly having received information, most commonly reported source of information was government office/local council (68%).

---

4. 19.081 SYP, using UN Operational Rate (514.85) on 1 August 2018.
5. Real estate registry
6. Multiple responses allowed
7. Comparison with 2017 could not be made because KI interviews were conducted in Ar-Raqqa in 2017.
61% of households reported inability to afford one or more NFI s in the three months preceding data collection.

Reported availability and unaffordability of NFI s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available in the local market</th>
<th>Unaffordable NFI s ¹ ² ³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hygiene Items (90%)</td>
<td>1. Clothing (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Blankets (82%)</td>
<td>2. Blankets (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clothing (80%)</td>
<td>3. Water container/Jerry can (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shoes (79%)</td>
<td>4. Generators (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Diapers (children) (80%)</td>
<td>5. Mattresses (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in access to basic household items (over the three months prior to data collection):

- No change: 75%
- Getting better: 15%
- Getting worse: 10%

Priority NFI needs reported per age and gender groups ⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1. Clothing</th>
<th>2. Shoes</th>
<th>3. Diapers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls (0-10y)</td>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (0-10y)</td>
<td>(90%)</td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Girls (11-17y)</td>
<td>(86%)</td>
<td>(53%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Boys (11-17y)</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
<td>(77%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (18-59y)</td>
<td>(58%)</td>
<td>(46%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (18-59y)</td>
<td>(65%)</td>
<td>(39%)</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Women (60+ y)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Men (60+ y)</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87% of households adopted coping strategies in response to a lack of NFI s, most commonly⁵:

1. Borrowing money
2. Spending savings
3. Selling household assets

ELECTRICITY

2% of households reported had no main source of electricity. For the remaining 98%, the main sources were as follows:

- Main network grid: 85%
- Neighbourhood generator: 11%
- Private generator: 2%

Reported hours of electricity available per day:

- 0-3 hours: 9%
- 4-7 hours: 28%
- 8-11 hours: 28%
- 12+ hours: 23%

85% of households reportedly adopted coping strategies in response to a lack of electricity, most commonly⁶:

1. Use battery powered devices such as torches
2. Remain without electricity and do not use coping strategies
3. Used electricity for certain purposes only

FUEL

Top 3 main sources of heating and cooking fuel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooking fuel</th>
<th>% of households using the source</th>
<th>Heating fuel</th>
<th>% of households using the source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Wood/Charcoal</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCESS TO MARKETS AND NFI SUPPORT

24% of households reportedly faced challenges to accessing a market, most commonly⁷:

- Distance to markets too far: 68%
- Lack of transportation to markets: 15%
- Physical constraints preventing access to markets: 6%

Means of accessing NFI s ¹:

- In the market: 92%
- Through relatives and friends: 18%
- Through free NFI distributions by local organisations: 3%

56% of households reportedly had accessed information regarding NFI support through government office. For the remaining 44%, the main sources were as follows:

- Friends/relatives: 17%
- Community representatives (e.g. sheikhs): 16%
- Approached directly by a humanitarian organisation: 7%
- Media (e.g. internet): 3%

64% of households reportedly received no information about NFI support in the past year.

---

8. Respondents were asked if there was one or more NFI s they needed to procure in the last 3 months but were unable to afford.
9. Percentages add up to more than 100% because multiple responses could be selected.
10. A coping strategy is a certain action employed by a household to overcome a lack of access to a certain item. For example, consuming fewer hot meals if there is a lack of cooking fuel.
11. Multiple responses allowed.

[OCHA Symbols: Electricity by Marc_PF, Fuel by DTDesign and Market by Ismail Nural from the Noun Project.]
12. A comparison between July 2017 and August 2018 data could not be made because KI interviews were conducted in Ar-Raqqa in 2017.