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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Teknaf peninsula fluctuates between periods of intense water scarcity, exacerbated by prolonged dry seasons, and inundation during monsoon season. As a sub-district, its economy is defined by fishing, salt production and agriculture. Its isolation from Cox’s Bazar and Ukhiya sub-district is apparent both geographically and through lack of numerous governmental, infrastructural and security resources. In addition, the large scale latest influx of Rohingya since August 2017 has led to myriad concerns over the safety and security of the population in Teknaf. Seeking to understand the dynamics and drivers of these protection threats and risks and to identify entry points and possible strategies to engagement, a group of UN and NGOs convened to conduct an assessment. Chief among their tasks was to understand the differential vulnerabilities and protection issues being faced at households and at a communal level within and across the different unions, and population demographics e.g. Bangladeshi host communities, Rohingya refugee, minority groups and in homogenous and mixed areas.

This report sets out some of the core protection trends that characterize the Teknaf sub-district. The findings are organized around the four key protection principles that guide protection interventions and best practice in humanitarian response: 1. Safety and Dignity; 2. Meaningful Access; 3. Accountability; and Participation. The report is organized along these lines to provide clear markers for areas of risk and engagement.

Overall the assessment highlights the need for: a) ensuring a coherent and clear strategy of engagement in Teknaf that is an inter-agency effort utilizing capacities, expertise and resources of different protection actors given the scale and complexity of the issues; b) standalone protection interventions need to be scaled up; and c) protection must be mainstreamed across all humanitarian interventions to maximize positive coping of affected populations.

Safety and Dignity
- High occurrence, fear and risk of: Gender Based Violence (GBV); human trafficking; drug use, smuggling and crimes; inter-communal disputes which overall has increased the vulnerability of communities to both physical and psychosocial risks.
- Dearth of effective and dedicated case management targeting drug addiction.
- Growing tensions between host community and refugee communities related to access and use of land, perceived and actual disparities in aid distribution and access to public services, broader resource competition and perceptions of power.

Meaningful Access
- Barriers to access to information, services and assistance are characterized by the lack of outdoor lightening, lack of safe spaces and fear of physical, sexual and gender-based violence.
- Lack of civil documentation, cultural barriers, security and administrative restrictions are reported as hindrances to free movement in the community.
• Social and cultural norms shape the restrictions on women and girls in the community including to the WASH facilities during the day and increasing their risk of physical safety by accessing WASH facilities at night or open defecation.
• Capacities of communities to participate in own decision-making and access choice around access to shelter, food, water and sanitation, health and education due to limited livelihoods and cash-based interventions.

Accountability
• Host community and refugees report significant challenges in accessing reliable, acceptable and effective forms of informal and formal access to justice mechanisms which remains marred by lack of resources and capacities at a sub district level. Despite efforts of international support to address this the gap militates against proper protection of rights and remedy for grave harm.
• Information dissemination remains weak especially around awareness and understanding of risks associated, inter alia, with early marriage, emergency preparedness, and trafficking.

Participation
• Participation of women and girls, and vulnerable persons in community governance mechanisms and structures are critical to enable people to claim their rights and adequately inform decision-making at a local level.
• Strategies around inclusion and participation remain limited and current practices reify exclusive and elite social norms.

With regards to interventions there was a clear need to ensure that humanitarian protection actors effectively advocate for and support:

1. Standalone protection programming including dedicated case management especially to address issues such as the proliferation of drug use, abuse and attendant impact on broader social structures.
2. Social cohesion measures that aim to provide collaborative engagement of host communities and refugees including joint community projects.
3. Strengthen public service provision that benefits a much broader definition of community targeting most vulnerable and addressing gaps and disparities in assistance.
4. Humanitarian programming writ large to have a much more defined component of protection and resilience building focusing on strengthening positive coping strategies and safety of vulnerable persons.
5. Cash for work and livelihoods protection that is driven with protection outcomes in mind to strengthen community choices and quality of services that they access.
6. Expand community awareness, information sharing and community level identification and mitigation of grave protection concerns.
7. Enable women and girls to access decision-making structures and ensure inclusion in humanitarian and broader programming in the area.
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Given the ongoing humanitarian crisis throughout Cox’s Bazar district, the assessment was conducted with an emergency response focus. As the assessment covered host, refugee and mixed community settings, the report should not be considered an analysis of strictly host community needs, rather, of the sub-district and its mixed population. By reviewing the sub-district, the assessment team had the opportunity to comprehensively outline and compare protection concerns, service gaps and communal coping mechanisms. This was pursued to formulate cross-cutting recommendations for respective Protection Working Groups, the Inter-Sector Coordination Group, local government and agencies undertaking protection programming on the ground.

The assessment team consisted of the following agencies:

- IOM, UN Migration Agency
- UNHCR in Collaboration with Relief Int. and BNWLA
- Solidarités International
- Plan International
- Oxfam
- Nonviolent Peaceforce
- Norwegian Church Aid

This was the first multi-agency assessment targeted specifically at general protection and emergency response for Teknaf sub-district since the onset of the current crisis. It was an opportunity to link agencies operating predominantly throughout Ukhiya to partners on the ground in Teknaf, and to establish initial community links with isolated areas of the Teknaf sub-district. Between the 18th and 28th of March 2018, the assessment team targeted 12 locations across the 6 unions and completed 105 interviews with 592 participants. The following diagrams demonstrate the composition of interviews conducted and geographic coverage of the assessment.
*4 FGDs (33 individuals) excluded from this table, gender unrecorded. Input from these 4 FGDs has still been integrated into the report.
Selected areas for the assessment were characterised as follows: a) predominantly host communities; b) predominantly refugee communities; and c) mixed areas. Mixed communities are best understood as host community members living alongside “older” refugees from influxes predating 2016, as well as host community members living within proximity to new refugee arrivals.

The methodology utilized key informant interviews (KII), focus group discussions (FGD), and debriefings with organizations conducting the interviews to gather observational data. The team set out to conduct at least four KII and five FGD per location, split equally between male and female groups, as well as adults and adolescent youth. FGDs were capped at ten participants. The KIIs were intended to capture perspectives from respective local authorities, local traditional leaders, any local community-based initiatives or groups, and representatives of vulnerable groups.

KIIs and FGDs were targeted at individuals and groups that together comprise a balanced and widespread perspective from the communities themselves. Criteria for KII included individuals with strong links to the respective community such as elected, religious and traditional leaders along with security actors, landowners and representatives of community groups. Both KIIs and FGDs included vulnerable community members. As much as possible, questions remained open-ended in order to invite participants to reflect predominantly on the unique needs and concerns that encompass their daily lives. Annex IV provides the breakdown of the different demographics within the communities targeted for this assessment.

The assessment teams were mixed, some with both international and national counterparts and some with only national teammates. Interviewers were protection officers or protection staff of participating agencies. Confidentiality and informed consent was explained all participants. Participants are kept anonymous, though some titles of key informants are given. Given the sensitive nature of protection assessments and potential findings, confidentiality and anonymity are respected throughout capturing and presenting data. Debrief sessions were held with Solidarités International and Nonviolent Peaceforce, and observational input was provided by Oxfam.

**LIMITATIONS**

Throughout the duration of the assessment and analysis, teams experienced a number of limitations. The developed questionnaires were lengthy, therefore FGDs often required 2-3 hours to complete. Interviewers were not equipped with recorders and relied solely on their notetaking abilities. Language comprehension of English and Rohingya was mixed within the large group of interviewers and the tools were developed in English. Due to time constraints the assessment tool was not translated and retranslated to English and Bangla to reduce ambiguities. Therefore, interviewers struggled to properly articulate the purpose behind the core questions and did not take advantage of utilizing probing questions provided in the tools.
National staff indicated the need for more preparation time before the interview period, especially for longer questionnaires that combine mixed formatting. There was a lack of capacity of staff in protection and conducting sensitive protection assessments. Not all interviewers used the same tool formats; some used the older, translated version while others used the latest version included in the annexures of this report. While this did not heavily influence the overall data received, it did delay the interpretation and collation of data and the overall analysis. For this assessment, emphasis was placed on qualitative data, which is critical in concretely understanding communal needs. Unfortunately, this limits the breadth of quantitative analysis that can be extracted from the data. A few FGDs did not clearly indicate respective gender, so they were excluded from any gender analysis; however, the overall input was integrated into the protection trends.

Women and girls were underrepresented in KII. While FGDs were successfully split between male and female to allow for conversations on sensitive issues such as Gender Based Violence (GBV), there was a significant underrepresentation of women and girls in KII and this reflects the lack of women in key leadership and community governance structures.

Age grouping and age disaggregation was not clearly agreed upon before the interview period. During the analysis phase, age groupings and definitions were extrapolated from the completed questionnaires and defined in the tables attached to this report, see annex IV. Additionally, it should be noted that this assessment is from a general protection lens, however, it identifies the need for in-depth assessments and analyses on GBV and Child Protection (CP) at the sub-district level. Many interviewers agreed that in following qualitative assessments, questionnaires need to be more open-ended, fewer in number and tailored to local dialect.

**CORE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF PROTECTION ISSUES**

The following section of the report provides an overview of the interlinked protection themes that are present throughout Teknaf sub-district: Safety and Dignity, Meaningful Access to Services, Accountability and Participation. From the immediate findings, there is a significant gap in prioritizing the safety and dignity of women, men, boys and girls of all ages and abilities. Moreover, there are details of the gendered protection risks and needs of community members. Secondly, it discusses the barriers to meaningful access of all community members to assistance and services. In addition, an overview is provided of the lack of attention to individuals and groups who are vulnerable or have reduced access to assistance and services. Thirdly, an analysis is provided of gaps in accountability mechanisms in the community, where community members can address concerns and complaints confidently and in confidence. Lastly, information is provided as to the participation and empowerment in accessing their rights to shelter, food, water and sanitation, health, and education.

**Safety and Dignity**
Across all areas, participants indicated feeling insecure in their respective communities, with clear “hot-spot” locations where particular threats were prevalent, and linked to persona, household and community activities or during certain times of the day and night. While the military provides camp management in Shamlapur Extension, and relatively consistent presence throughout predominantly refugee inhabited areas, its reach does not cover the entire sub-district. Law enforcement is also concentrated in some refugee and host communities, but not all. In refugee settings, such as Ali Kali, it was noted that Camp-in-Charge (CiC) and local authorities were not widely seen by community members, therefore presumed to be absent. In the isolated areas of the sub-district, such as Sabrang, there are no visible, static police posts. In such isolated areas, the community is reliant on ad hoc community watch groups or community policing committees. When crimes are reported, even to local police, the police themselves often refer follow-up to these community groups. Given this, response time for reported cases is variable. Lack of consistent, accountable security actors translates into heightened risks of exploitation, abuse, violent and petty crimes which we will elaborate below further. Additionally, newly arrived refugees discussed their lack of knowledge and orientation of the Teknaf area.

Rampant spread of unverified information and rumours played a critical role in perceptions of insecurity at a personal and more social level. Participants often indicated feeling insecure in areas that were unfamiliar to them that drives their own choices around movement, access to services, and support that they seek. For example, in Ali Kali, the refugee community are not used to living near hills and expressed considerable concern and fear about wild animals (elephants).

Participants across host and refugee settings noted theft and robbery as a major concern. Many host participants correlated the increase in criminality with the recent influx of Rohginya. Refugee participants on the other hand associate theft and robbery with desperation and lack of resources. Opportunistic crimes committed by “older” refugees from pervious influxes as well as host community members were mentioned. In general, participants from both host and refugee communities see many people “taking advantage of the crisis” to incite insecurity through both spreading of rumors and criminal acts.

The ever-present threat of abduction and trafficking is a major concern within all communities. However, instability culminating from the current crisis has exacerbated the threat. Both host and refugee communities listed abduction as a prominent protection concern. Participants eluded to both short-term or temporary abductions and abductions that resulted in trafficking. Short-term or temporary abductions may occur for indentured labor or debt-seeking. Men, women, boys and girls of all ages and abilities have all been identified as potential targets for abduction and trafficking. Both host and refugee communities identified the “hilly areas” adjacent to their respective homes as particular areas of concern and practiced limited movements to and within these areas. Communities living close to Marine Drive also believed themselves to be at heightened risk of abduction, as it is closer to well-known trafficking routes.

Female host community members from Shamlapur Extension shared that the overall risk of abduction and trafficking have increased. One female participant commented: "We have
experienced that young women were forcibly taken away by their boyfriend while they were on movement on the main road. Risk of trafficking is higher now, after the construction on Marine Drive. Girls are scared of being out on the road on their own.”

Furthermore, male community members from Shamlapur Extension noted that as day laborers they are earning lower wages, making it more difficult to support their families due to the increasing prices in the local market. The gendered role of men as providers to their families are putting them at risk of trafficking – forced labour, while they increase their movement to less familiar areas to seek employment.

Trafficking of drugs throughout Teknaf is not a new phenomenon. There is a correlation between insecurity and increased trafficking and consumption of yaba. Both host and refugee communities are heavily impacted by yaba trafficking and consumption. There is a perception within communities of a linkage between a decrease in economic opportunities and yaba. Participants in FGDs across various locations in Teknaf asserted that they believe yaba consumption is directly connected to upsurges in crimes such as theft and all types and forms of GBV particularly economic and intimate partner violence.

With increasing movement of humanitarian actors, a major concern throughout the three sub-districts of Cox’s Bazar is the rise in vehicular accidents. There is recognition from the community of a system in place to observe dangerous driving and to ensure drivers are held accountable. Community members use informal systems to settle disputes that arise from road accidents. In Kanjorpara, participants acknowledged that 20,000 BDT are paid to settle the dispute.

The following section outlines the myriad obstacles to women’s participation in accessing services across both refugee and host settings. There are many similar challenges for both refugee and host women and girls, but there are also significant differences. Collectively, women and girls experience restricted movement, fear of stigma and shame, fear of reporting and raising concerns on GBV. There is a reported need for women and girl’s safe spaces, where they are able to confidentially and confidently raise their concerns. Female headed households are at increased risk of falling outside of the scope of service provision. Participants described that services targeting single, female headed households are often far from their homes or outside of their respective communities and are unable to access the services.

The assessment confirmed the prevalence of GBV throughout the sub-district across refugee and host communities. In host community settings, intimate partner violence was repeatedly mentioned as increasing in frequency while in refugee settings there were reports on sexual violence with perpetrators both unknown and known. Participants in Nyapara and Shamlapur Extensions described ongoing verbal harassment targeting women and girls. Adolescent girls from the host community explained that they are afraid to go to school alone because of the fear

---

1 According to the University of Maryland, Center for Substance Abuse Research, “yabba” or “yaba” is the slang, or colloquial term, for a methamphetamine drug laced with caffeine that is produced, trafficked and consumed throughout Asia. 29 Oct 2013, http://www.cesar.umd.edu/cesar/drugs/yaba.asp
of being harassed or teased by man or young boys on road. The fear of harassment both physical and verbal are preventing girls and women from accessing education, specialized services and participating in community activities.

Child marriage is present in both host and refugee communities. While the law does not recognize marriage between Rohingya and Bangladesh individuals, such mixed marriages continue to take place. Children, especially adolescent girls, are forced into marriage at an early age. Female participants from Sabrang have observed that child marriage is increasing day by day, especially for poor families. Increasing child marriages is leading to increasing young mothers giving birth, increasing young mother and infant mortality which further compounds concerns around gaps in medical services. This clearly demonstrates that there is knowledge within the communities especially amongst women about the negative consequence of child marriage on adolescent girls. However, more support is required to build their skills and knowledge in preventing it.

Community members are struggling to collect firewood across the sub-district. The situation grows direr during the rainy season. Many households remain unsure of where they will find fuel. Firewood collection inherently carries many risks. One of them is tension between host and refugee communities. The lack of fuel is perceived to be increasing the frequency of intimate partner violence. In Ali Kali women explained that sometimes when they are unable to cook food, they are physically abused by their husbands. Adolescents and children are traveling long distances throughout the adjacent forests to collect firewood. Mothers are worried about sending their young girls for firewood collection, but female headed households often feel they are left with no other options. Similarly, in Shamlapur Extension, women and adolescent girls are perceived to be most affected by firewood scarcity and collection. Traditionally, firewood collection is considered a man’s responsibility, in the absence of a male family member due to death or disability the role and responsibility of collecting wood is transferred to female members which then increases their risk of GBV.

For example, in Ali Kali it was reported that male community members were at high risk of beatings and extortion by host community while out collecting firewood.

When families are able, they will purchase firewood from the host community, but it is generally expensive. Due to the influx there has been a drastic increase in the occurrence of firewood collection within the district causing deforestation. This has led to residents traveling further and further distances to reach usable firewood. This was a core concern expressed in British Para.

Shelters are perceived as inadequate and communities are struggling to reinforce their shelters for the rainy and cyclone season raising concerns around safety. In Chakmarkul, participants complained of lack of ventilation and airflow causing overheating within the shelters. Lack of space and overcrowding is a key feature. There are expressed concerns of shelters’ durability during the monsoon season. Respondents believe that their roofs can easily be blown away by strong winds. Community members have asked for further support in the provision of more bamboo and rope for reinforcing shelters.
The Rohingya response is characterized by both WASH and protection. Community volunteers express the needs for improvement of WASH facilities. The current conditions are threatening the health and wellbeing of community members and are exacerbating related safety concerns. For instance, latrines are largely not separated by gender. In all of the refugee settings, women and girls expressed concerns with using WASH facilities during the day. In Chakmarkul, girls explicitly said that they need burkhas to cover in order to go to a latrine during the day. Not only the lack of gender separated latrines is an issue, but the overall lack of sufficient latrines has led to ongoing open defecation in areas adjacent to camps that are considered insecure especially at night. Women and girls are forced to either create small holes for defecation near their shelters, openly defecate in hot-spot areas, or move at night to latrines, accompanied by male relatives.

There is a lack of bathing spaces and water points. In addition, due to water scarcity women are sometimes only able to bathe every 3 to 4 days. The water crisis means long queues and poor water quality. In order to avoid the long queues during the day, it has been reported that women and girls resort to fetching water at night, often as late as midnight or 1am. Furthermore, it was reported in British Para, that families are paying 20 taka per month for electricity to operate the communal water pump. Members of the host community blame the refugee influx for exacerbating the water crisis, further intensifying the ongoing tensions between host and refugee communities.

The assessment found that not all key components of protection and inclusion, such as safety and dignity, access, participation and accountability, are reflected in the emergency preparedness and response in the Teknaf area. There is an information gap and lack of awareness of life-saving information for the monsoon season. While community leaders and local authorities are included and consulted in the emergency preparation activities, there has been no systematic dissemination of information about both the preparedness and response. The impact is clearly not being felt at the local, household level. Few participants could recall attending awareness raising sessions conducted by both INGO and NNGO, however, they were unable to recall or elaborate on the details of the curriculum or key messages. Additionally, there is no clear indication of how vulnerable groups have engaged into emergency preparedness and response to ensure their specific safety risk and needs are addressed.

The current crisis, immense strains on resources and jeopardized topography have created conditions that host communities have not necessarily encountered before, especially in regard to how they have historically prepared for emergencies. Community members are requesting for more information about emergency preparedness and assistance in infrastructural support.

Aside from overall lack of emergency preparedness and access to lifesaving information throughout Teknaf, there is an intense and widespread fear of losing access to medical services during the rainy season. MSF is perceived to be the most reliable medical service provider, even in Sabrang where MSF has minimal presence or reach and does not provide primary health care. Many of the most isolated areas of Teknaf are cut-off from services for at least some period of time each year. In Sabrang, pregnant women and persons with disabilities were identified as the
most at-risk. The overriding fear of losing access revolves around the deteriorating roadways and insufficient infrastructure. Also, in Sabrang, respondents described how over the course of the last 7 years the access road to the southern most parts of the peninsula have been continuously deteriorating. The community is worried that this year’s flood will completely cut them off from greater Teknaf and thereby from humanitarian assistance and support.

Finally, the majority of respondents across the various locations said that relations between the host and refugee communities are “good” or “positive.” However, there is a recognition of the deteriorating relationship between the communities. The host communities ascribed all of their socioeconomic problems to the presence of Rohingya, i.e. the shortage of jobs and employment, loss of wages, rent, decreased access to water points and restricted movement along with inter and intra-ethnic conflicts over emerging power dynamics.

In areas like New Pallan Para, the host community described newly arrived refugees as violent, threatening and disrespectful of Bangladeshi laws. They ascribed issues such as increased market prices, screenings at newly established checkpoints and overall traffic jams to the influx. A similar sentiment was found in Naitongpara, where host community expressed general fear of the refugees’ presence. Across the sub-district, host communities consider that the presence of refugees has impacted wages and increased competition over job opportunities. Furthermore, transportation costs have also increased along with the presence of security actors and checkpoints.

Within the mixed communities, there was a perceived difference in acceptance between host community members living alongside “older” refugees from previous influxes and those living within close proximity to new arrivals. Refugees from influxes predating 2016 consider themselves more integrated into the host community. With this perception of acceptance and tolerance, has grown an emerging power dynamic between refugee groups, where in some cases “older” refugees are perceived to be exploiting new arrivals.

The assessment team also observed members from the host community blocking access to water points in areas shared with refugees. Throughout parts of Teknaf, water points are managed by “Water Management Committees,” which comprise of both host and refugee community members. However, after construction in a number of areas, the management of the water points are taken over by the landowners and refugees’ access becomes restricted.

Demanding rent has become a prevalent issue across the district, but notably throughout Teknaf sub-district given the incidence of informal and makeshift settlements. Refugees often feel they are unable to cover the monthly expenses, however they refuse to raise this concern to their respective community leaders for fear of eviction. The following reflects rent amounts articulated to the assessment team from respective areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rent Amount(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shamlapur Extension</td>
<td>200 taka per month for refugee families from host landlords on private land; refugee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
women claimed paying between 2000 to 3000 taka per year

Ali Kali
500 taka per month for shelter. Refugee women shared that “we [Rohingya women] get scolded, sometimes threaten to vacant the place if we fail to pay for rent. Hence, whether we eat or not, first we save the money for rent.”

Nyapara Extension, Shalbon
200 to 400 taka per month per room for refugee families from host landlords

Domdomia
400 taka per plot per month for refugee families from host landlords

British Para
200 to 300 taka per month per “shed” for refugee families from host landlords. Refugees explained that sometimes they must sell their rations in order to cover rent. "We have no money to pay the monthly rent. If we cannot pay the monthly rent, the landlord will not let us stay there anymore."

An overwhelming opinion articulated directly by host communities throughout Teknaf was that refugees need to leave. Whereas host communities were renowned for their supportive and welcoming behavior during the height of the influx last year, their patience is wavering as more resources are taken and insufficient assistance is provided.

Meaningful Access to Services

Over the course of the influx, both host and refugee community members reported corruption by some actors. There were some cases when both refugee and host community members were prevented from accessing services and assistance.

Refugee and host communities are experiencing restricted or hindered movement as a consequence of the current crisis albeit the types of restrictions and hindrances are substantially different.

Rohingya participants in the assessment explained that before the current crisis, they felt that they had freedom to move throughout Cox’s Bazar district, especially when they traveled to the area intermittently seeking services. The situation has changed and several security actors including the Army, Bangladeshi Border Guard and local police have all established multiple posts and checkpoints throughout the district. Respondents further explained that refugees can move freely throughout their respective camp or community but are unable to pass through checkpoints manned by security actors. The host community are able to move freely, however, are required to carry their civil documentations such as National ID, Birth Certificate or voter ID.
card at all times to be given access. At the parish or union level, some administrative offices request an amount between 5000 to 10000 taka for birth certificates and IDs. Host community members with dwindling incomes are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain the necessary documentation to overcome the impediments to their movement throughout the district.

In New Pallan Para both male and female members of the host community explained a restriction in their movement due to the number of security points and fear of harassment from security actors, which further restrict their movement.

Both host and refugee community members reported the need for civil documentation to move freely within their respective areas to access services such as healthcare and visit family and friends. Host women are required to carry their birth certificates while refugee women explained to be in constant fear of arrest due to their lack of civil documentation. In addition, infrastructural impediments such as degrading roadways that will be easily washed away by the early rains are restricting physical access.

There are unsafe movements from both host and refugee communities that have contributed to increased activity at night exposing them to myriad risks. Families actively prevent their female members from moving at night due to yaba consumption and related criminal activities. Moreover, the lack of lighting in the community is a contributing factor to restricting movement. For example, in Chakmarkul, refugee women are afraid to go to the latrine at night because of fear of harassment and sexual assault. To address their fears, they have requested male relatives to accompany them at night to the latrines. There is a need to further explore the reasoning behind lack of access during the day to WASH facilities. In addition, in Shamalpur Extension there is a fear of elephant attacks at night. Across many of the communities, including in Ali Kali and Nyapara Extension, solar light distributions and installations are seen as a positive mitigating measure. In Nyapara, the community have established community watch groups to patrol areas. Ultimately, solar and/or torch distribution coupled with increased night presence and security is desired by the communities across Teknaf.

Communal social norms act as a barrier to the freedom of movement and access of women and girls to services. Female respondents from Chakmakul highlighted the need of burkha to increase their movement in the community, specifically to access services. Additionally, male family members believe that by restricting their female family members’ movement, they are ultimately protecting them. A female landowner in New Pallan Para explained that “women and girls cannot move outside at night without [being accompanied by] a male. There are social restrictions and fear of sexual abuse.” Furthermore, mothers and older female family members are limiting adolescent girls’ movement because of fear of harassment and sexual assault.

Freedom of movement is further reducing the access of women and girls to voice and raise concerns of their safety and security. The lack of safe spaces for women to report confidentially, lack of confidence in local authorities and service providers, and a lack of overall information about services, referral systems and the justice system contribute to the reduced safety and dignity of women and girls. Collectively, these issues contribute to the lack of participation and
access of women and girls to community activities. In Chakmarkul, women and girls are confident in raising concerns about shortage and access of food and water, especially to their majhis, but they fear reporting intimate partner violence as it may lead to further physical violence and abuse. GBV is seen by the women in the community as a private matter and there is a cloud of silence and shame over it. The shortage of safe spaces in both refugee and host communities prevents women and girls from expressing their emotions and developing social and supportive networks.

There is a need and desire from the community for more information on GBV services and referral pathways to report GBV. As described above, there is a cloud of both silence and shame surrounding GBV that prevents women and girls from reporting. Existing GBV services are overwhelmed with complex and high caseloads affecting their capacity to provide support to survivors of violence. Respondents described that agencies were unable to provide follow-up support to survivors. In addition, this illustrated the need to build and strengthen the case management skills and knowledge of GBV actors to ensure that quality services are provided. Women from the host communities expressed anger and frustration about the lack of access to GBV services and push back from local authorities to file complaints against refugees.

Mediation is a preferred approach of the community to handle intimate partner violence. Female respondents reported that local authorities transfer responsibility to majhis to resolve domestic dispute. It is unclear if the process of mediation conducted in the community by majhis respects the rights and safety of women and girls.

Across the communities interviewed, most participants did not know where to go for legal assistance. Most refugees admitted that they would ask their majhis for information or support, especially in reporting criminal cases to CiC, the Army or local police. Very few were aware of agencies such as BRAC, BNWLA or other referral agencies. Similarly, host community respondents could not clearly articulate where they would go to seek reliable legal assistance.

The majority of communities interviewed indicated an absence of life saving information. Information points are present in a number of locations, however, there is a lack of awareness about the utility of such information points. This highlights the need for more innovative modes and strategies in disseminating lifesaving information to community members that are not tied and centralized in physical information static points. Similarly, there are no clear complaint mechanisms in the assessed communities.

There are insufficient educational facilities across the sub-district. To access education the majority of children travel long distances and most cannot afford the daily transportation costs. For instance, it costs 80 taka per day for adolescent boys and girls from New Pallan Para to attend the closest high school. In the more isolated areas of southern Teknaf, including Sabrang, it is difficult to find and retain teachers that are willing to commute long distances, and live in the community itself. For adolescents in Sabrang, the closest high school is in Nhila town.
Both registered refugees from previous influxes and new arrivals complain about their children’s access to government schools being blocked due to their lack of national identification cards. In British Para, the local Imam raised the issue that their madrassah had been providing classes for hundreds of refugee children, but their teachers are not receiving financial support. Previously, their attendance rate hovered between 20 to 30 pupils, but now attendance is closer to 120 to 140 children. The strain on local resources is a current point of contention within the community.

Access to education for girls is limited due to social and cultural norms. Girls after reaching the age of 12 are prevented by families from attending school. A local Imam explained that girls are not allowed to attend lessons at the madrassah after the age 12 as it is presumed that they have begun menstruation. Across many of the communities women explained that girls are not allowed to continue their attendance after they begin menstruating.

The cumulative cost of education, including transportation, tuition, stationary and educational equipment impedes the access of both boys and girls. In areas like Ali Kali and Shalbon, there are temporary learning centers, madrassahs and maktobs. However, in some of the facilities parents are asked to pay tuition fees. A female respondent shared her reluctance to send her son to the local madrassah because it is widely known that the educators use corporal punishment against children who cannot pay. Children are forced to leave school because parents cannot bear the costs of education.

Inability to access medical facilities is a core concern across the sub-district for both refugees and host communities. For refugees, the majority of healthcare services are inaccessible without medical referrals which are sometimes difficult to obtain and when a referral is obtained, transportation costs from the camps of Teknaf to other parts of the district are another barrier to access. Voucher programs designed to increase access to medical assistance are viewed as corruptible. Most community members fear losing access to medical services during the rainy season. Lack of adequate, safe maternal health care during the height of the rainy season is another great concern.

Respondents described the medical services in their location as inaccessible, poor quality or overstretched. In Wabrang, community members described the community clinic as ill equipped, lacking medicine and in need of more doctors and health professionals. Another example is in Ali Kali, where the medical center managed by an INGO in the camp is perceived by the majority of residents in the area to only provide services for Rohingya and not host community. However, the hospital is characterized by long queues and insufficient supplies. Refugees face greater difficulties accessing medical services at night due to increased insecurity, restricted movement and lack of adequate transportation to the limited facilities that operate 24 hours.

Lack of economic and livelihood opportunities for both host and refugee communities was cited by respondents as obstacles to diversifying their families’ diets.
Participants of the assessment described an absence of specialized services, or strategies to increase access to services and assistance, for vulnerable groups such as persons with special needs, disabilities, elderly or overall mobility constraints. It was reported that vulnerable individuals and families pay volunteers from INGOs and NNGOs up to 50 taka for assistance in carrying their goods to their shelters and households. Another concern is the limited interventions for physiotherapy and mobility devices within reasonable proximity of persons with disabilities. Respondents from isolated areas of the sub-district described the increasing difficulty they face in reaching Teknaf town or Cox’s Bazar to attend physiotherapy sessions leading to cancelation of or missing, appointments which reduces the efficacy of services. Lastly, there appears to be a severe shortage of ophthalmological services in Teknaf. Individuals with sight impairment are not perceived to be treated or prioritized equally to other persons with disabilities even though blindness impacts their overall mobility, access and participation.

Accountability

Access to reliable justice mechanisms is varied and absent in many areas of Teknaf. Most respondents, across all locations under the assessment eluded to utilizing informal justice mechanisms. In the absence of accountable security actors and confidential reporting systems, communities are looking to their elected or appointed leaders, religious leaders and traditional leaders to mediate communal and domestic dispute. In refugee communities in Nyapara, members feel more comfortable seeking the support of majhis, CiC, UNHCR or IOM staff, in lieu of reaching out directly to local police. Furthermore, they are encouraged to report cases through their respective majhis. Formal justice systems and reporting mechanisms are viewed by the community as costly and corruptible and are not supportive in increasing access to justice. There is a lack of confidence and accountability by and from both host and refugee communities in the justice system at the local level.

Moreover, there is an evident fear of local authorities from both host and refugee communities. A number of female respondents from the refugee community reported that they were comfortable approaching the Army to report domestic violence incidents yet were reluctant to approach and seek support from local police. Residents of Chakmarkul explained that they feel far more comfortable approaching their majhis or the Army for assistance, protection, guidance and to report crimes. Police are widely perceived by the community as unapproachable and ineffective. Additionally, community members do not see the benefit in reporting to police because filing a case is cumbersome, lengthy and demonstrative of very little effect.

However, there is an imbalance in perception and views of the effectiveness of the justice system and accountability mechanisms between community members and leaders. A local chairman expressed faith in the local justice system and said: “Yes, all have access. There are also village courts in Union Parishad which operates every Monday and anyone can get justice. If some legal issue is not our jurisdiction like rape, murder that we refer to police station/court. Sometime court also refers some case to us which we resolve through our village courts.”
Participation

Teknaf sub-district is a predominantly agriculture-based economy. Aside from pockets of tourism during the dry season along its beaches, the majority of male community members earn their income through small businesses, day laboring, farming, salt cultivation and fishing. Before the onset of the humanitarian crisis, 500 taka was the daily rate of labor. Due to the influx, day laborers’ salaries have dropped to 200 taka a day.

Additionally, due to the huge levels of movement and transportation of Rohingya community members across the river and the bay area to safety in Bangladesh, there has been a crack-down on maritime activities along Teknaf’s borders. Fishermen are being prohibited by local authorities and the Bangladeshi Border Guard from openly fishing in the waters that they have survived off of for generations, but local fishermen continue to fish in secret. Sabrang appeared the most significantly impacted by the restriction of fishing in its area.

The government and local authorities are encouraging communities to seek other economic and livelihood opportunities. However, support is needed to build the capacity of community members to recognize the transferable skills into other trades. Ultimately, in an area that is under-resourced and isolated from much of the peninsula, more support is needed to create opportunities and employment.

Host community women interviewed in Sabrang reported livelihoods programs from international agencies have paused due to the influx. They are hopeful livelihood projects that support in building their businesses and life skills will continue so they are able to contribute to their families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To reiterate, this report is not solely focused on host community needs. Rather, it is an undertaking to comprehensively articulate the unique protection concerns observed throughout the Teknaf sub-district and its mixed population. A core component of the assessment was seeking recommendations directly from participants on how protection concerns should be addressed within their respective communities. Participants proposed community-led interventions, as well as actions that they believe local government, security actors and humanitarians should take to hold themselves accountable for the safety and security of residents of Teknaf. The following recommendations illustrate those opinions.

To Cox Bazar Humanitarian Community:

1. Increase presence of strong protection agencies for protection monitoring, general and specialized case management for Gender Based Violence (GBV), Child Protection (CP), and Counter Trafficking (CT) as well as bolstering support for emergency response and preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)
Increase the presence of agencies with technical and case management expertise to address the gap in services at Union and UP level. Both participants in FGDs and national staff on the ground expressed a sincere need for specialized case management in child protection, gender-based violence, trafficking and emergency preparedness. This is to address overall care for survivors and facilitate access to safe, adequate and appropriate services with the overall indirect benefit of increasing deterrence and reducing incidents of violence.

2. Protection actors to bolster support and engagement with community level protection mechanisms and enable strategies to ensure positive coping that also include a strong integration of resilience activities.
Promote and support community protection mechanisms which could include community-led safety and security groups trained and monitored by security actors, as well as community protection teams, child protection teams and women’s protection teams mobilized and capacitated at the local level. Such teams would devise nonviolent, safe, and localized strategies for deterring and reducing violence. Activities could range from mobilizing and awareness raising throughout their respective community to case referrals, facilitating safe access to justice mechanisms, patrolling in hot-spot areas and various forms of protective engagement and monitoring.

3. Increase functional and sustainable lighting in camps, especially areas of perceived high risk around service points and access pathways.
These high-risk areas may include WASH facilities as well as the perimeter or “hilly areas” adjacent to the camps. Residents of Chakmarkul proposed “at least 5 lights per block and household level distribution of torches.” Widespread construction of light posts coupled with handheld torches in camps and isolated communities.

4. Increase the number of reliable and operational Safe/ Friendly Space for Women, Children and Vulnerable Individuals.
Increase the number of reliable operationalized safe spaces for women, children and vulnerable community members. Currently, legal assistance agencies and GBV-response agencies are overstretched in the area. They are only able to provide minimum levels of “crisis counseling” or PFA. Safe spaces exercising strict confidentiality and providing PSS services for survivors of violence is critical for trauma response and confidence building in referrals and access to justice.

5. Conduct a review of transport/voucher assistance interventions and identify areas of improvement.

6. Increase presence of appropriate medical facilities and where possible mobile services to support refugee and host community
Increase reliable medical facilities within reasonable proximity to both host and refugee communities and improve referral mechanisms to more adequately reflect the existing service agencies and their capacities.
7. Strengthen and expand social cohesion projects to support communities to address inter-communal tensions, disagreements, foster dialogue and cooperation.
Facilitate ongoing consultation for community-based social cohesion projects which focus on protection, DRR, livelihoods and peacebuilding and assist communities in both host and refugee areas with technical advice in designing projects that address their unique needs. Where necessary, provide safe, neutral spaces for dialogue and activities. Consistently engage all stakeholders.

8. Strengthen Anti-Trafficking interventions including measures to prevent, and protect: INGOs and NGOs should take more interest and initiative in anti-trafficking activities targeting awareness raising within communities and direct assistance to the victims of trafficking.

To Local Government Authorities and Law Enforcement Actors:

9. Strengthen localized emergency preparedness measures aimed at increasing understanding and awareness at household and community level.
Engage in mass awareness raising on emergency preparedness for cyclone and monsoon seasons; encourage advocacy at the DC level on infrastructural development and an emergency plan for areas isolated during monsoon season, especially areas such as Sabrang that are at heightened risk of being cut-off from critical medical services; and streamline an information dissemination network for early warning activation that is mirrored throughout all of the unions. At this point, it is apparent that emergency preparedness and early warning messaging may be disseminated through sub-district, Union and local leaders but that activation of early warning and respective messaging is not understood or reaching the general public. If messaging is not reaching active community members, then vulnerable groups are more likely to be completely left out of emergency preparedness and emergency response. Identification of safe shelters and safe zones. Mobilization of community safety units responsible for information dissemination, safe movement, and first response.

10. Enable access to education for all children throughout Teknaf sub district without discrimination.
Open up access to education for all children throughout the sub-district. Additional educational infrastructure is necessary in the more isolated areas as children and adolescents cannot afford the daily transport costs for schools that are outside of their area.

11. Support road safety infrastructural improvements to reduce the risk of road accidents and measures to hold recklessness to account.
Place more speed-bumps on roadways near schools, communal halls, and areas where high concentration of foot-traffic exists. Enforce speeding fines and encourage local authorities to hold drivers accountable. This includes drivers for INGO and NGO staff frequently moving between Cox’s Bazar, Ukiyah and Teknaf. Participants only indicated that reparations are paid at the household level for any vehicular accidents. There was no indication of how local authorities hold drivers accountable for excess speeding or accidents. If there is a system in place, neither the host nor refugee communities could properly articulate it.
12. Promote a joint effort to build social cohesion efforts at inter-governmental level and engaging communities in the effort.
   Such programs could include inter and intra communal dialogue on host-refugee tensions and cross-cutting intercommunal protection teams/mechanisms. Collaborative activities targeting youth from both communities could serve as gateway programs to larger-scale dialogue and interventions. As exhibited in the observational data for Ali Kali and New Pallan Para, there is an urgent need for a restorative circle between host and refugee communities with the intention of rebuilding empathy and a broader understanding of their shared crisis. Promotion and utilization of social cohesion interventions is intrinsically linked to the prevention of violent extremism.

To the Office of Refugee Relief and Repatriation Commission (RRRC)

13. Support alternative livelihoods programming for host communities and refugees to allow freedom of choice and promote positive coping to allow people to address their own needs.
   Establish alternative livelihoods programming for host communities as first and secondary incomes (such as fishing and day labor) are compromised by the drastic rise in the sub-district’s population. Establish livelihoods and/or income generating opportunities for refugees as food and NFI assistance is insufficient to meet needs. Additionally, refugees sell portions of their rations in order to diversify their diet or procure sorely needed essential items such as clothes, etc.

14. Work with humanitarian actors to support intra and inter communal programming aimed at fostering community cohesion and addressing joint needs.
   Promote social cohesion projects conducted by humanitarian actors in areas under RRRC management. Such projects would include cross-demographic activities, bringing together both host and refugee communities for dialogue, addressing joint needs, and collaborative protection, DRR, livelihoods and peacebuilding activities. Initially, projects should utilize quick-impact strategies with fixed ability to transition toward mid-term and longer-term, sustainable interventions.

15. Improve the capacity of existing community-based Dispute Resolution Committees and gain the trust and confidence of communities.

To Upzila Nirbahi Office (UNO):

16. Improve Access to Justice to provide safe, confidential and appropriate recourse for different forms of harm ensuring a vulnerability centered approach.
   Improve access to justice that is safe and confidential. Participants described perpetrators being released after payment of bribes and indicated an overall unreliability of authorities on the ground. These perceptions together with widespread fear of reprisals have led to underreporting of protection incidents. Advocacy at the DC and RRRC levels for improved, accountable justice mechanisms that practice strict confidentiality and safe, adequate
responses for crimes and abuses is necessary. Confidence building around access to justice cannot thrive without reliable mechanisms in place. Trust in these mechanisms will not happen unless communities see perpetrators being appropriately held accountable for crimes committed, be they host or refugee.

17. Increase presence of well-trained security actors in high risk areas to provide safety for refugees and host communities.
Increased security presence by local authorities and the military at high-risk areas at night. Increase capacity of community watch groups and security actors in the respective areas in order to both deter opportunistnic violence and ensure a timely response. Active measures are also needed to promote dialogue between security actors and communities to allow community priorities and issues to drive actions.

18. Strengthen DC level response for Anti Trafficking and coordination with key Counter Trafficking actors within the humanitarian community to allow safe identification, referral and follow up. Increase DC-level response for trafficking in collaboration of all relevant actors. Currently the identified cases referred to the Union Parish or Union authorities are met with little response. Due to an overwhelmed system and an inability to respond to the ever-growing caseload, the communities themselves feel deterred to report and therefore countless cases must be overlooked.

To the Protection Sector – Cox Bazar:

19. Draft guidelines for safe handling and referral of protection issues to Child Protection (CP), Gender Based Violence (GBV) and Counter Trafficking (CT) actors.
Draft guidelines for security actors, especially military, on safe handling and referral of CP, SGBV and CT cases to the appropriate case management actors. Guidelines must include how to safely receive cases, what appropriate and immediate PFA measures should be taken and clearly identify referral agencies for transferring cases as soon as possible. Provide humanitarian-led, capacity building around implementing these guidelines in the field and sufficient follow-up. Structure consistent, field-level engagement between humanitarians and all security actors to promote and implement safe referral mechanisms.

20. Advocate to Deputy Commissioner (DC) and RRRC to permit regular night presence for humanitarians throughout areas under Camp In Charge (CiC) management.
Structure presence as a deterrent. Advocate for the use of regular food and vehicular patrols by appropriate security actors in high risk areas at night.

21. Organize a workshop between relevant members of the PWG and the CSO/NGO Forum as well as a workshop for the Protection Sector and Deputy Commissioner (DC) specifically on findings from this report.
Tailor the workshop(s) to focus on law and order, access to justice, obstacles to accessing life-saving services, and brainstorming social cohesion programming. Collaborate with ISCG in
organizing and facilitating said workshop(s) at the district and sub-district levels. Workshop(s) should culminate with clear action plans for all participating actors.

ANNEXES:

I. Methodology
II. KII Tool
III. FGD Tool
IV. KII and FGD per location
The purpose of the Teknaf Joint Assessment is to gain a comprehensive perspective of the general protection concerns experienced by both host and refugee communities living throughout the sub-district. The assessment looks at protection concerns that have culminated from the current crisis/influx of refugees since October 2016, and therefore is conducted through an emergency response lens. Analysis will look at current coping mechanisms being utilized and compare across the sub-district.

As much as possible, questions will remain open-ended in order to invite participants to reflect predominantly on the unique needs/concerns that encompass their daily lives. Interviews and discussion groups will be presented with questionnaires tailored to assist in analyzing and understanding protection risks/concerns, access constraints and communal coping mechanisms.

The proposed methodology is mixed between key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD). It is recommended to conduct at least 4 KII per location, along with 5 FGD, ideally split equally between male and female groups, as well as older and adolescent youth. FGDs should include 6 to 10 participants maximally. The KII should capture perspectives from local authorities, local community-based organizations/initiatives, local traditional leaders and representatives of vulnerable groups. The locations addressed by youth. FGDs should include 6 to 10 participants maximally. The KII should capture perspectives from local authorities, local community-based organizations/initiatives, local traditional leaders and representatives of vulnerable groups.

The locations and compositions of the KII/FGD per union should be organized in the following tables for host, refugee and mixed communities:

### Target Interviews - Host

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Male Youth</th>
<th>Female Youth</th>
<th>Male Elderly</th>
<th>Female Elderly</th>
<th>Male Community Committee Chair</th>
<th>Male Rep. of Vulnerable Group</th>
<th>Male Landowner</th>
<th>Male Shodar/Imam</th>
<th>Male Elderly (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Community Committee Chair (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Rep. of Vulnerable Group (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Elderly (FGD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf S. – New Pallian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf S. – Kajumpura</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whykong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Target Interviews - Refugees

The purpose of the Teknaf Joint Assessment is to gain a comprehensive perspective of the general protection concerns experienced by both host and refugee communities living throughout the sub-district. The assessment looks at protection concerns that have culminated from the current crisis/influx of refugees since October 2016, and therefore is conducted through an emergency response lens. Analysis will look at current coping mechanisms being utilized and compare across the sub-district.

As much as possible, questions will remain open-ended in order to invite participants to reflect predominantly on the unique needs/concerns that encompass their daily lives. Interviews and discussion groups will be presented with questionnaires tailored to assist in analyzing and understanding protection risks/concerns, access constraints and communal coping mechanisms.

The proposed methodology is mixed between key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD). It is recommended to conduct at least 4 KII per location, along with 5 FGD, ideally split equally between male and female groups, as well as older and adolescent youth. FGDs should include 6 to 10 participants maximally. The KII should capture perspectives from local authorities, local community-based organizations/initiatives, local traditional leaders and representatives of vulnerable groups. The locations and compositions of the KII/FGD per union should be organized in the following tables for host, refugee and mixed communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Male Youth</th>
<th>Female Youth</th>
<th>Male Elderly</th>
<th>Female Elderly</th>
<th>Male Community Committee Chair</th>
<th>Male Rep. of Vulnerable Group</th>
<th>Male Landowner</th>
<th>Male Shodar/Imam</th>
<th>Male Elderly (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Community Committee Chair (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Rep. of Vulnerable Group (FGD)</th>
<th>Male Elderly (FGD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf S. – New Pallian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf S. – Kajumpura</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whykong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union - Village</td>
<td>KII Mahji and/or military</td>
<td>KII Local landowner</td>
<td>KII Shodar/Imam</td>
<td>KII Rep. of Vulnerable Group *or Rep. of community committee</td>
<td>FGD Male</td>
<td>FGD Female</td>
<td>FGE Male Youth</td>
<td>FGD Female Youth</td>
<td>FGD Elderly Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whykong – Chakmarkul</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baharchara – Shamalpur Extension</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhilla – Ali Kali (Leda)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhilla – Nyapara Extension</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhilla - Domdomia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhilla – British Para</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target interviews – both host and refugees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union - Village</th>
<th>KII Elected Chairman and/or Mahji</th>
<th>KII Local landowner</th>
<th>KII Shodar/Imam</th>
<th>KII Rep. of Vulnerable Group *or Rep. of community committee</th>
<th>FGD Male (host)</th>
<th>FGD Female</th>
<th>FGE Male (refugee)</th>
<th>FGD Female (refugee)</th>
<th>FGD Elderly Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ideally, the above referenced methodology will produce at least 48 KIIs and approximately 50 FGDs. It is likely that the number of FGDs conducted will be less than 55, given the anticipated difficulty in mobilizing youth groups. This should reflect a minimum for overall analysis.

The above tables outline the recommended locations for conducting KII and FGD in order to cover the entire Teknaf Upzila. It also highlights each type of KII and FGD that needs to be identified, jointly, by the interviewing INGOs and the tables are separated by target demographic. While areas are targeted for host or refugee interviews, this does not mean to imply that the communities themselves are not more mixed. However, the separation of targets culminated from a discussion around whether certain groups of refugees are “hiding” and their participation in KII/FGD could compromise their safety and security. Additionally, while the tables are meant to outline a desired variety and quantity of interviews, the assessment team(s) should remain flexible to any changes on the ground. If assessment teams experience difficulty in mobilizing certain community leaders or groups, then use the KII and FGD that can be mobilized to identify additional options, such as leaders of any community groups, associations, women’s committees, educational platforms, etc. Given Solidarites’ expansive network of volunteers across Teknaf Upzila, they will take the lead in mobilizing the majority of interviews, however, there are locations within this methodology where Solidarites does not have presence. At these locations, there will need to be a joint effort to mobilize.

In general, KII criteria is for community members with strong links to the diverse demographic/needs of their respective community. It has been proposed that within host communities, target KII should be with elected leaders and religious leaders, as well as local authority (local police); whereas within refugee communities, target KII should be with majhis, landowners hosting refugees and religious leaders. If possible, in camp settings, assessment teams should attempt to interview military and/or CIC. In mixed communities, assessment teams should endeavor to connect with elected leaders and majhis, only if the atmospherics permit.
The composition of assessment teams will be mixed, some with both international and national counterparts and some with purely national teammates. Interviewers should have a moderate and above level of experience and background in the protection field in general. There will be a briefing with all participating parties before the assessment period commences, in order to assert that all interviewers have a complete grasp of protection definitions, scenarios, use of confidentiality and interviewing techniques. This briefing is included in the proposed work plan timetable below.

**Proposed Work Plan:**

- **18th March** – assessment brief with all participant (at Ukiyah hub?)
- **19 - 25th March** – assessment period
- **27th March** – findings provided to NP for collating/consolidating
- **28 – 31st March** – collective analysis, input gathered from all participating agencies, NP formulating report

**Proposed Locations per Organization:**

- **Solidarites** – Kanjopora, Shilkhali, Domdomia,
- **Oxfam** – Ali Kali, New Pallan Para, Nyapara Extension – Shalbon with UNHCR
- **IOM** – Naittongpara
- **IOM and Nonviolent Peaceforce** – Shamalpur Extension
- **Nonviolent Peaceforce** – Wabrang
- **Solidarite and Nonviolent Peaceforce** - Jaliapara Shawporidip
- **UNHCR (implementing partner)** – Nyapara Extension – Shalbon with Oxfam
- **Plan International + UNHCR + BNW** – Chakmarkul with UNHCR
Begin the interview with an introduction of yourself and any other colleagues who may be present (Hello, my name is....., I work for [AGENCY] in the role of........). Explain that the purpose of this questionnaire is for us to understand the needs among people and families who have been affected, and how it might be possible for [AGENCY] to help. Reinforce message that we cannot meet all needs, and the questionnaire cannot be a guarantee of assistance. If required, provide a short explanation of what [AGENCY] is before beginning the actual questions. Inform the respondent that this is voluntary, anonymous and the can request not to participate, or to stop the interview at any time. The respondent may also choose not to answer specific questions, and share information with the joint agencies partaking in this assessment, and to use data gathered for advocacy purposes. Seek appropriate consent for sharing information with the joint agencies partaking in this assessment, and to use data gathered for advocacy purposes. Provide a description of safety, security and protection concerns in the beginning so that the participants can better familiarize themselves with the following questions.

I. How do different community members access each of the following services? Do they experience any challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Member</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Adequate Shelter</th>
<th>Food/NFI Distribution</th>
<th>WASH</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Information/Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESS TO SERVICES**

Begin the interview with an introduction of yourself and any other colleagues who may be present (Hello, my name is....., I work for [AGENCY] in the role of........). Explain that the purpose of this questionnaire is for us to understand the needs among people and families who have been affected, and how it might be possible for [AGENCY] to help. Reinforce message that we cannot meet all needs, and the questionnaire cannot be a guarantee of assistance. If required, provide a short explanation of what [AGENCY] is before beginning the actual questions. Inform the respondent that this is voluntary, anonymous and the can request not to participate, or to stop the interview at any time. The respondent may also choose not to answer specific questions, and share information with the joint agencies partaking in this assessment, and to use data gathered for advocacy purposes. Provide a description of safety, security and protection concerns in the beginning so that the participants can better familiarize themselves with the following questions.

I. How do different community members access each of the following services? Do they experience any challenges?
2. Have you heard of community members having to pay or exchange services to receive aid? If yes, which kind of aid?

3. When a crime is committed, do you have access to either a formal or informal justice system? Do you have access to legal assistance? Are perpetrators punished for crimes committed? If so, how?

### THREATS, VULNERABILITY, OCCURRENCE, COPING MECHANISMS

4. What are the 3 main difficulties or dangers that your community is experiencing?

For each difficulty/danger identified, probe the participants for the following additional information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where? When</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the most affected? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are they affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the community doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are authorities doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are humanitarian actors doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think should be done to address those dangers and difficulties? Who should do it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is your community aware of how to report a protection concern or who to report to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are there specific/unique concerns experienced by children? (UASC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you able to move freely within your community and outside of your</td>
<td>Are you able to move freely within your community and outside of your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Has your community made plans for the monsoon/rainy period? If yes,</td>
<td>Has your community made plans for the monsoon/rainy period? If yes, what? Who are the individuals/groups in your community that are the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what? Who are the individuals/groups in your community that are the</td>
<td>most aware about emergency preparedness and response procedures? Who generally take decisions when an emergency occurs? (If you are one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most aware about emergency preparedness and response procedures?</td>
<td>of them, what types of decisions do you make and how do you communicate them?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who generally take decisions when an emergency occurs? (If you are one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of them, what types of decisions do you make and how do you communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are there vulnerable groups within your community, such as unaccompanied</td>
<td>Are there vulnerable groups within your community, such as unaccompanied children, female-headed households, elderly, disabled or other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children, female-headed households, elderly, disabled or other? How</td>
<td>How will these groups be assisted during the monsoon/rainy period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will these groups be assisted during the monsoon/rainy period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have you heard any information about how you could better prepare</td>
<td>Have you heard any information about how you could better prepare for the monsoon season? Have you already been reached directly by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the monsoon season? Have you already been reached directly by</td>
<td>information on emergency preparedness and response? (either question)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information on emergency preparedness and response? (either question)</td>
<td>If yes, which information and from whom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, which information and from whom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, what information do you need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Who are the individuals/groups in your community the most aware about emergency preparedness and response procedures? Who generally take decisions when an emergency occurs?

12. In your community, are there groups having specific needs during an emergency? What are those specific needs?

WOMEN AND GIRLS PARTICIPATION

13. In this community is there a place where women and girls, in particular, feel unsafe or try to avoid? What is it that makes this place unsafe? According to you, what could be done in this community to create a safer environment for women and girls?

14. In your opinion do women or girls face obstacles in raising their concerns to any of the following groups: their family, their community, local authorities in their community, or humanitarian actors present in their community. If so, what are the obstacles?

Probing Questions:

- When faced with security concerns do women and girls have a place where they can discuss their problems?
- When a woman or a girl is victim of violence within this community, does she know where to go and what are the services available to support her? What happens when a woman or girl is a victim of violence from outside of the community?
- Do you think women and girls could be scared or ashamed to raise their concerns to any of the above referenced groups? (family, community, local authorities, humanitarians)

### HOST-REFUGEE RELATIONS

15. How is the relationship between the host community and refugee community where you live?

### CONFLICT RESOLUTION

16. Including yourself, who are considered the leaders within your community? What types of issues are brought to them? Does this differ from before the current crisis?

*For refugee KII only: Does your community leadership structure look different now compared to before last year’s displacement period?

17. If your communities experience conflict, how do you expect to resolve them?

Follow-up questions if the interviewee is receptive to this topic:
What types of conflict was experienced before displacement?
What types of conflict have been experienced after the displacement?
What types of conflicts are of concern in the near future?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Any additional concerns, comments or needs on protection expressed by the interviewee(s):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF QUESTIONNAIRE**

Conclude the interview by thanking the respondent for their time and by offering to answer any remaining questions that they may have for the interviewing INGO. Then, before moving onto the next interview, place this questionnaire (if being completed on paper) out of sight either in a folder, bag, or at the bottom of the clipboard. It is important to remain professional and confidential throughout the assessment process.

Any final notes or comments by the interviewer or interviewee relevant to this discussion?
Begin the interview with an introduction of yourself and any other colleagues who may be present (Hello, my name is....., I work for [AGENCY] in the role of........). Explain that the purpose of this questionnaire is for us to understand the needs among people and families who have been affected, and how it might be possible for [AGENCY] to help. Reinforce message that we cannot meet all needs, and that the questionnaire cannot be a guarantee of assistance. If required, provide a short explanation of what [AGENCY] is. Before beginning the actual questionnaire, inform the respondent that this is voluntary, anonymous and they can request not to participate, or to stop the interview at any time. The respondent may also choose not to answer specific questions. After providing an estimate of time required, and receiving verbal approval to proceed, begin the questionnaire. Provide a description of safety, security and protection concerns in the beginning so that the participants can better familiarize themselves with the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composition: □ Host Community Discussion Group □ Female Discussion Group □ Male Focus Discussion Group □ Mixed Discussion Group □ Refugee Community Discussion Group

Interview:
- Date: [ ]
- Location: [ ]
- Union: [ ]
- Contact: [ ]
- Organization: [ ]

*Complete before the FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION**
1. How do the following different community members access each of the following services in your community?

Use the below table to outline responses for each type of community member and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community member:</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Adequate Shelter</th>
<th>WASH</th>
<th>Food/NFI Distribution</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Information/referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (under 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (under 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other specific groups (PSN, PwD, FHH, CHH, UAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Have you heard of community members having to pay or exchange services to receive aid? If yes, which kind of aid?

3. When a crime is committed, do you have access to either a formal or informal justice system? Do you have access to legal assistance?
4. What are the 3 main difficulties or dangers that your community is experiencing?

For each difficulty/danger identified, probe the participants for the following additional information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where? When</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the most affected? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are they affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the community doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are authorities doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are humanitarian agencies doing to address this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think should be done to address those dangers and difficulties? Who should do it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Are you able to move freely within your community and outside of your community?

6. Has your community made plans for the monsoon/rainy period? If yes, what? Who are the individuals/groups in your community that are the most aware about emergency preparedness and response procedures? Who generally take decisions when an emergency occurs?

7. Are there vulnerable groups within your community, such as unaccompanied children, female-headed households, elderly, disabled or other? How will these groups be assisted during the monsoon/rainy period?

8. Have you heard any information about how you could better prepare for the monsoon season? Have you already been reached directly by information on emergency preparedness and response? *If yes, which information and from whom?*

   *If no, what information do you need?*
## WOMEN AND GIRLS PARTICIPATION

9. In this community is there a place where women and girls, in particular, feel unsafe or try to avoid? What is it that makes this place unsafe? According to you, what could be done in this community to create a safer environment for women and girls?

10. In your opinion do women or girls face obstacles in raising their concerns to any of the following groups: their family, their community, local authorities in their community, or humanitarian actors present in their community. If so, what are the obstacles?

Probing Questions:

- When faced with security concerns do women and girls have a place where they can discuss their problems?
- When a woman or a girl is victim of violence within this community, does she know where to go and what are the services available to support her? What happens when a woman or girl is a victim of violence from outside of the community?
- Do you think women and girls could be scared or ashamed to raise their concerns to any of the above referenced groups? (family, community, local authorities, humanitarians)

## HOST-REFUGEE RELATIONS

11. How is the relationship between the host community and refugee community where you live?

## CONFLICT RESOLUTION

12. Who would you consider a community leader and what issues would you normally go to them for?

*Before Displacement:*
After Displacement:

13. If your communities experience conflict, how do you expect to resolve them?

Follow-up question if time permits:
Does your community resolve conflicts differently now compared to before the current crisis?

| Any additional concerns, comments or needs on protection expressed by the interviewee(s): |
|                                                                                          |

**END OF QUESTIONNAIRE**

Conclude the interview by thanking the respondent for their time and by offering to answer any remaining questions that they may have for the interviewing INGO. Then, before moving onto the next interview, place this questionnaire (if being completed on paper) out of sight either in a folder, bag, or at the bottom of the clipboard. It is important to remain professional and confidential throughout the assessment process.

Any final notes or comments by the interviewer or interviewee relevant to this discussion?
ANNEX IV: Breakdown of KII and FGD per location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Types of FGD and KII conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Whykong Union – Kanjorpara | • Total FGDs: 5 with host community  
  o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
  o 1 with male adults  
  o 1 with male elderly  
  o 1 with female adolescent/youths  
  o 1 with female adult  
  • Total KIIs: 3 with male host community members  
  o Chairman for Whykong Union  
  o Local Imam  
  o Primary school teacher |
| Whykong Union – Chakmarkul | • Total FGDs: 5 with refugee community  
  o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
  o 1 with male adults  
  o 1 with female adolescent/youths  
  o 1 with female adults  
  o 1 mixed elderly  
  • Total KIIs: 4 with host and refugee communities  
  o Sergeant in Bangladeshi Army (male, host)  
  o local landowner (male, host)  
  o Imam (male, refugee)  
  o Representative of Community Committee (female, refugee) |
| Baharchara Union – Shamlapur Extension | • Total FGDs: 10 with host and refugee communities  
  o 1 with male mixed ages (host)  
  o 1 with male adolescent/youths (host)  
  o 1 with female adolescent/youths (host)  
  o 1 with female adults (host)  
  o 1 with mixed elderly (host)  
  o 1 with male adolescent/youths (refugee)  
  o 1 with male adult (refugee)  
  o 1 with female adolescent/youths (refugee)  
  o 1 with female adults (refugee)  
  o 1 with mixed elderly (refugee)  
  • Total KIIs: 4 with male host and refugee community members  
  o Army Colonel (host)  
  o Head teacher (host)  
  o Imam (refugee)  
  o Person with disability (refugee) |
| Baharchara Union – Shilkhali | • Total FGDs: 5 with host community  
  o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
  o 2 with male adults  
  o 1 with male adults/elderly |
| Nhila Union – Ali Kali | • Total KIIs: 4 with male host and refugee community members  
| | o Community member (host)  
| | o Sardar (host)  
| | o UP Chairman of Baharchara (host)  
| | o Imam (refugee)  
| Nhila Union – Nyapara Extension | • Total FGDs: 4 with refugee community  
| | o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with male adults  
| | o 1 with female adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with female adults  
| | • Total KIIs: 3 with male host and refugee community members  
| | o Landowner (host)  
| | o Majhi (refugee)  
| | o Imam (refugee)  
| Nhila Union – Domdomia | • Total FGDs: 4 with host and refugee communities  
| | o 1 with male adults (host)  
| | o 1 with male adolescent/youths (refugee)  
| | o 1 with male elderly (refugee)  
| | o 1 with female adolescent/youths (refugee)  
| | • Total KIIs: 3 with male host and refugee community members  
| | o Imam (host)  
| | o Landowner (host)  
| | o Majhi (refugee)  
| Nhila Union – British Para | • Total FGDs: 5 with refugee community  
| | o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with male adults  
| | o 1 with female adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with female adults  
| | o 1 with mixed elderly  
| | • Total KIIs: 2 with male host and refugee community members  
| | o Imam (host)  
| | o Vulnerable community member (refugee)  
| Nhila Union – Wabrang | • Total FGDs: 5 with host community  
| | o 1 with male adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with male adults  
| | o 1 with female adolescent/youths  
| | o 1 with female adults  
| | o 1 with mixed elderly  
<p>| | • Total KIIs: 4 with host community |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>FGDs</th>
<th>KIIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf P. – Naittongpara</td>
<td>Head Master of Nhila High School (male)</td>
<td>o 1 with male adolescent/youths</td>
<td>o 2 with female adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landowner (male)</td>
<td>o 1 with male adults</td>
<td>o 1 with female adolescent/youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of Sporting Club (male)</td>
<td>o 2 with female adults</td>
<td>o Community health volunteer (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teknaf S. – New Pallan Para</td>
<td>Total FGDs: 5 with host community</td>
<td>• Total FGDs: 4 with host community</td>
<td>• Total KIIs: 5 with host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>o 2 with male adults</td>
<td>o Sardar (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Imam</td>
<td>o 2 with male adults</td>
<td>o Superintendent (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrang – Jaliapara Shawporidip</td>
<td>Sabrang Chairman</td>
<td>o 1 with male adolescent/youths</td>
<td>o UP Chairman (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school teacher</td>
<td>o 1 with male adults</td>
<td>o Landowner (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teacher/pharmacist</td>
<td>o 1 with female adolescent/youths</td>
<td>o UP member (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>o 1 with female adults</td>
<td>o Landowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FGDs: Focus Group Discussions
- KIIs: Key Informant Interviews