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ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Over the last four decades, Rohingya people have been fleeing in successive waves to Bangladesh from Rakhine State, in Myanmar. Periodic outbreaks of violence led to large exoduses of Rohingya, most recently following the events of August 2017 in Myanmar.¹ As of August 2021, 900,000 refugees were residing in 34 camps in Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas.²³ With the crisis moving into its fifth year, prospects of a return of refugees to Myanmar continue to be uncertain.⁴

The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and associated protocols put in place in camps on 24 March 2020 to curb the spread of the virus resulted in reduced humanitarian access and service delivery throughout much of 2020. With only a limited number of essential services having been provided and severely disrupted access to self-reliance activities and cash among refugees, pre-existing needs were exacerbated, in particular related to food security, health-seeking behaviour, education, and protection-related issues. The Rohingya refugee camps and surrounding areas are also particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change as well as natural and human-induced hazards, including cyclones, monsoon floods, and fires. These factors compounded the households’ capacities to meet their needs and cope with gaps in services, in particular among the most at-risk population groups.³ A renewed lockdown, implemented in April 2021, may have further aggravated the situation.

Against this background, a Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (J-MSNA) was conducted to support detailed humanitarian planning, meeting the multi-sectoral needs of affected populations, and to enhance the ability of operational partners to meet the strategic aims of donors and coordinating bodies. Building on past J-MSNAs and other assessments, the 2021 J-MSNA aimed to provide an accurate snapshot of the situation with the specific objectives of (1) providing a comprehensive evidence base of the diverse multi-sectoral needs among refugee populations and the host community to inform the 2022 Joint Response Plan; (2) providing an analysis of how refugee population and host community needs have changed in 2021; and (3) providing the basis for a joint multi-stakeholder analysis process.

A total of 3,683 households were surveyed across the 34 refugee camps in Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas. Households were sampled from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees’ (UNHCR) refugee registration database using a stratified random sampling approach, with camps as the strata. Household survey data collection took place between 12 July and 26 August 2021. Each interview was conducted with an adult household representative responding on behalf of the household and its members.

Household-level findings in this factsheet are presented at the camp level at a 95% confidence level and with 10% margin of error, unless stated otherwise. A more detailed methodology, as well as caveats and limitations, can be found under “Background & Methodology” on page 2.

The J-MSNA was funded by UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO). The assessment was coordinated through the Inter-Sector Coordination Group’s (ISCG) MSNA Technical Working Group (TWG), led by the ISCG and composed of UNHCR, IOM Needs and Population Monitoring (IOM NPM), World Food Programme Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (WFP VAM), ACAPS, and Helvetas with REACH as a technical implementing partner.

Number of interviews per camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp 1E</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Camp 8W</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Camp 19</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 1W</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Camp 9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Camp 20</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 2E</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Camp 10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Camp 20E</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 2W</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Camp 11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Camp 21</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Camp 12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Camp 22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Camp 13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Camp 23</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 4E</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Camp 14</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Camp 24</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Camp 15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Camp 25</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Camp 16</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Camp 26</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 7</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Camp 17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Camp 27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp 8E</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Camp 18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>NRC/KRC</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Information is applicable at the time of data collection (July-August 2021). One camp has since been closed.
⁴ Upazilas are the fourth tier of administration in Bangladesh, forming sub-units of district.
BACKGROUND & METHODOLOGY

- **Assessment design:** Indicator identification and tool development were done in close consultation with all sectors. The tools were then finalised by the MSNA TWG.

- **Sampling strategy:** Household survey target sample sizes for each camp were based on the most recent population figures available from UNHCR. Points were randomly sampled from the UNHCR refugee registration database. Additional buffer points were sampled to account for instances of non-eligibility or non-response.

- **Data collection:** Data for the household survey was collected remotely over the phone from 12 July to 26 August 2021. Due to heavy rain and subsequent flooding in the surveyed areas, data collection was interrupted from 3 to 15 August. In total, 3,683 household interviews were conducted. In addition, 20 focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted in-person between 21 and 29 September 2021 (10 with men, 10 with women).

- **Data cleaning and checking:** At the end of each day, the household survey data was checked and cleaning was conducted according to pre-established standard operating procedures, with checks including outlier checks, the categorisation of "other" responses, and the removal or replacement of incomplete or inaccurate records. All changes were documented in a cleaning log. The FGDs (conducted in Rohingya) were recorded, and the recordings transcribed and translated into English for analysis.

- **Data analysis:** Basic descriptive and exploratory statistical analysis of the household survey data was conducted, including (1) weighted proportions; (2) testing for statistically significant differences in outcomes between households of different demographic characteristics; and (3) a comparison of 2019-2020-2021 J-MSNA results, where possible (no statistical significance testing was conducted for 2019-2020-2021 comparisons). Data was further analysed by gender of respondent. The full analysis tables were shared with sectors.

CAVEATS AND LIMITATIONS

- **Sampling frame:** As the sampling frame did not cover the entire camp population, results can be considered representative of the population included in the sampling frame. They are indicative of the camp population as a whole. Due to limitations in the sampling frame, Nayapara and Kutupalong camps were sampled and analysed as one stratum.

- **Phone interviews:** Due to restrictions on movement, access to camps, and face-to-face interviews, as part of the COVID-19 preventative measures, all interviews were conducted over the phone. This created certain challenges and limitations:
  - Given expected poor connectivity and the lack of personal interaction during a phone interview, questionnaire size was limited to avoid losing respondents’ attention.
  - As phone ownership is more prevalent among men, a lower proportion of female respondents were reached than might have been reached during an in-person survey.
  - Unequal phone ownership may also have slightly biased the results towards better educated households.

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

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

- **Perceptions:** Questions on household perceptions may not directly reflect the realities of service provision in refugee camps - only individuals' perceptions of them.

- **Limitations of household surveys:** While household-level quantitative surveys seek to provide quantifiable information that can be generalised to the populations of interest, the methodology is not suited to provide in-depth explanations of complex issues. Thus, questions on "how" or "why" (e.g. reasons for incurring debt, differences between population groups, etc.) were further investigated through the accompanying qualitative component. The unit of measurement for this assessment was the household, which does not allow assessment of intra-household dynamics (including in relation to intra-household gender norms, roles and dynamics; disability; age; etc.). Readers are reminded to supplement and triangulate findings from this survey with other data sources.

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

- **Timing of assessment:** When interpreting findings, users are informed that data collection was: (1) conducted following the implementation of a renewed lockdown in mid-April 2021; (2) carried out during the monsoon season; and (3) included the festival of Eid-ul-Adha; as well as (4) a major flood event at the start of August 2021.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 86%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 25%
- Severe (severity score 3): 61%
- Stress (severity score 2): 2%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 1%
- Not classified: 12%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 85%
- Food security & livelihoods: 79%
- WASH: 61%
- Education: 51%
- Protection: 30%
- Nutrition: 19%
- Health: 1%

TOP PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 68%
- Access to food: 60%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 38%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 31%
- Access to clean drinking water: 24%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 15%
- Access to education: 15%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.63
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.60
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.62
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.55
5. Access to clean drinking water: 0.36
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.27
7. Access to education: 0.26

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 4.8 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 11% (50%)
- Male: 89% (50%)

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 1% (1%)
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 6% (16%)
- After 24 August 2017: 93% (78%)

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 22% (22%)
- Male: 78% (78%)

Total number of household interviews: 113

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 97).
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
5. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 82%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 82% Severe (severity score 3)
- 9% Stress (severity score 2)
- 9% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

76% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 74%
- Limited ventilation: 27%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 13%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 8%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 6%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 99%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 16%
- Damage to/ unstable bamboo structure: 10%

44% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

28% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

39% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 34%
- Repaired/ upgraded the roof structure: 17%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 13%
- Installed bracing: 6%
- Repaired the walls: 4%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 65%
- No money to pay for materials: 51%
- Materials are unavailable: 7%
- No money to pay for labour: 4%
- No need to improve: 30%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 75% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 73% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 44). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

**RENT PAYMENT**
- **33%** of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**NON-FOOD ITEMS**
- **% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:**
  - Fans: 89%
  - Shoes: 81%
  - Clothing and winter clothing: 65%
  - Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 61%
  - Kitchen sets: 47%
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 36%
  - Mosquito nets: 32%
  - Blankets: 31%

**COOKING FUEL**
- **97%** of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- **48%** of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.
- **58%** of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**COPING**
- **% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-/NFI-related reasons:**
  - To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 19%
  - To pay rent: 5%
  - To repair or build shelter: 4%
  - To access or pay for cooking fuel: 2%
  - To access or pay for household items: 2%

- **53%** of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 75%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 16% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 59% Severe (severity score 3)
- 24% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 1% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 11% Poor
- 42% Borderline
- 48% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

LIVELIHOODS

65% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

Food items do not last until next distribution: 42%
Items received through distributions are of low quality: 14%
Long queues at distribution points: 9%
Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 5%
Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 4%
Items received through distributions are less preferred: 3%
Inaccessibility (e.g. due to road conditions): 2%

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- % of households by coping strategy

- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.2

To access or pay for food 88%

To access or pay for healthcare 35%

To access or pay for clothes, shoes 19%

To access or pay for education 6%

To pay rent 5%

To repair or build shelter 4%

To access or pay for cooking fuel 2%

Adopted coping strategy

Coping strategy not available to household

Exhausted coping strategy

No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.3

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: begging; sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions; reduced essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fuel; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/ temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 56%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 2%
- Severe (severity score 3): 54%
- Stress (severity score 2): 15%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 29%
- Not classified: 0%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 96% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection.

- 48% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection:

- 47%

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- 42%

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one (32%)
2. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water (12%)
3. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking (8%)
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking (4%)
5. Spend money (or credit) that should be used otherwise on water (1%)

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 59%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 22%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 12%
- VIP toilet: 4%
- Bucket toilet and put in latrine after: 4%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Top 5 reported problems

- Females: Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded (37%)
- Males: Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded (36%)

Females

- 12% Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding
- 11% Latrines are unclean/unhygienic
- 9% Lack of light inside latrines
- 6% Lack of light outside latrines
- 4% Latrines are too far

Males

- 15% Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded
- 12% Bathing facilities are too far
- 4% Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic
- 2% Bathing facilities are not functioning
- 1% Lack of light outside bathing facilities

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level (60%)
- > 1 bin at household level (33%)
- Access to communal bin/pit (5%)
- None (4%)

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segemented) (54%)
- Bin at household level (not segregated) (35%)
- Throws waste in the open (16%)
- Communal bin/pit (segmented) (4%)
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated) (1%)

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 112; households with males, n = 112). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 48%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4) 9%
- Severe (severity score 3) 39%
- Stress (severity score 2) 20%
- None or minimal (severity score 1) 24%
- Not classified 8%

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

37% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled in learning facilities** before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- 36% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.
- 25% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

39% of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- 39% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
- 35% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards **benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning**

- Girls:
  - 62% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 18% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 14% Lack of light in shelter
  - 9% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 9% Lack of technological devices needed to access home-based learning

- Boys:
  - 53% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 15% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 12% Lack of technological devices needed to access home-based learning
  - 9% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 8% Lack of light in shelter

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 96; households with boys, n = 85 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
### SENDING BACK

% of households with at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open¹

- Girls: 34%
- Boys: 30%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back²

- Girls: 34%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back³

- Boys: 23%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>Risk of infection with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID-19 on the way or at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No appropriate learning</td>
<td>No appropriate learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content provided for</td>
<td>content provided for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger children</td>
<td>older children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider</td>
<td>Children have fallen too far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education important</td>
<td>behind on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back⁵

Girls

- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 16%
- No appropriate learning content provided for younger children: 8%
- Lack of qualified teaching staff: 7%
- Learning facilities overcrowded: 5%
- Children have fallen too far behind on learning: 5%
- Lack of qualified teaching staff: 6%

Boys

- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 17%
- No appropriate learning content provided for younger children: 7%
- Learning facilities overcrowded: 6%
- Children have fallen too far behind on learning: 6%
- Lack of qualified teaching staff: 6%

### COPING

6% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education⁶

### EXPENDITURES

19% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
² The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
³ The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
⁴ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 45 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁵ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 70 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁶ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 27%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 11% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 16% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 56% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 5% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

33% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Education: 19%
- Safe areas for playing: 11%
- Safety and security: 7%
- Food: 6%
- Shelter: 4%
- Health care: 4%
- Psychosocial support: 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/Girls

- Markets: 5% (1st)
- Social/community areas: 4% (2nd)
- On their way to different facilities: 4% (3rd)
- In own shelter (at home): 3% (4th)
- Latrines or bathing facilities: 3% (5th)

Men/Boys

- Markets: 7% (1st)
- Social/community areas: 5% (2nd)
- On their way to different facilities: 5% (3rd)
- In own shelter (at home): 3% (4th)
- Latrines or bathing facilities: 2% (5th)

13% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROTECTION NEEDS

46% of households reported needing protection services or support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Needed</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 30% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 19%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021) 1

of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan 1

of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan 1

MESSAGING

of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan 1

OVERALL REACH

of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan 1

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

81% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan 1

61% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan 1

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

18% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan 2

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 110).
% of households with a health LSG: 2%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 3): 0%
- Severe (severity score 2): 2%
- Stress (severity score 1): 42%
- None or minimal: 56%
- Not classified: 1%

WELLBEING

47% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

96% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic: 81%
- Private clinic: 35%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 24%
- Traditional/ community healer: 2%
- Government clinic: 1%

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location.

BARRIERS

48% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 30%
- Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded: 22%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 8%
- Did not receive correct medications: 8%
- No functional health facility nearby: 5%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

73% of households reported travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation: 0 - < 20 min

- 26% 20 - 30 min
- 2% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (92%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (7%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 98). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

35% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Range (BDT)} & \text{65}\% & \text{32}\% & \text{2}\% & \text{1}\% \\
\hline
\text{None} & \text{> 0 - 500} & \text{> 500 - 1000} & \text{> 1000 - 2000} & \text{> 2000 - 5000}
\end{array}\]

**COPING**

35% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 28% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 26% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- 31% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

- Yes: 88%
- No: 10%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%
- Don’t have community representative: 1%

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- Health care: 12%
- Bathing facilities (females): 12%
- Bathing facilities (males): 8%
- Food assistance: 5%
- Latrines (males): 4%
- Latrines (females): 4%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- Learning facilities (boys): 5%
- Latrines (males): 3%
- Latrines (females): 3%
- Learning facilities (girls): 2%
- Food assistance: 2%
- Health care: 1%
- Bathing facilities (males): 0%
- Bathing facilities (females): 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 112). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 112; n, latrines (males) = 112; n, bathing facilities (females) = 112; n, bathing facilities (males) = 112; n, learning facilities (girls) = 49 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 112; n, food assistance = 113). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 92% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.
- 31% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 76%
- Livelihoods: 56%
- Remote education: 48%
- Shelter: 45%
- Site management/development: 42%
- Health services: 29%
- Nutrition services: 29%
- Protection services: 27%
- Water: 18%
- Food assistance: 9%
- Sanitation: 4%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 63% of households reported having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.
- 12% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 6%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 4%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 3%
- Language barriers: 2%
- The process was too complicated: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
# MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

## % of households with multi-sectoral needs: 90%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

## % of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POPULATION PROFILE

- **Average household size**: 5.3 persons
- **Gender of head of household**: 7%
  - Female: 92%
  - Male: 1%
  - Other: 7%
- **Gender of respondent**: 19%
  - Female: 80%
  - Male: 1%
  - Other: 1%
- **Total number of household interviews**: 114

## % of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security &amp; livelihoods</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; non-food items</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Priority Needs

- **% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked)**:
  - Shelter materials/upgrade: 67%
  - Access to food: 65%
  - Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 36%
  - Household/cooking items: 29%
  - Access to self-reliance activities: 23%
  - Access to education: 17%
  - Access to clean drinking water: 16%

## Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.71
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.50
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.61
4. Household/cooking items: 0.42
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.42
6. Access to education: 0.30
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.26

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 103).
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 35). Results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

---

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 73%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 69% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 15% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

---

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

72% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 63%
- Limited ventilation: 23%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 7%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 92%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 19%
- Damage to walls: 10%

46% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

18% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

- Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
  - Replaced tarpaulin: 25%
  - Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 19%
  - Tied down the roof/shelter: 18%
  - Repaired/upgraded the floor: 3%
  - Repaired/upgraded the windows and/or doors: 2%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 70%
- No money to pay for materials: 42%
- Materials are unavailable: 13%
- No money to pay for labour: 4%
- No need to improve: 29%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 80% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 69% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves
**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

**RENT PAYMENT**
- 11% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**NON-FOOD ITEMS**
- % of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:
  - Fans: 94%
  - Shoes: 67%
  - Clothing and winter clothing: 58%
  - Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 54%
  - Kitchen sets: 50%
  - Mosquito nets: 47%
  - Blankets: 36%
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 36%

**COOKING FUEL**
- 98% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- 41% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.
- % of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):
  - Bought firewood: 54%
  - Bought LPG refills: 31%
  - Collected firewood: 25%

**COPING**
- % of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-/NFI-related reasons:
  - To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 16%
  - To repair or build shelter: 4%
  - To access or pay for household items: 3%
  - To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 112).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by the World Food Programme (WFP) are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options. 79% of households with a food security Local Solidarity Group (LSG) of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 18% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 61% Severe (severity score 3)
- 18% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 3% Not classified

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 11% Poor
- 59% Borderline
- 30% Acceptable

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 1% None
- 4% > 0 - 500
- 9% > 500 - 1000
- 15% > 1000 - 2000
- 54% > 2000 - 5000
- 18% > 5000

1% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution (32%)
2. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (6%)
3. Items received through distributions are of low quality (4%)
4. Long queues at distribution points (4%)
5. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport (3%)
6. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site (3%)
7. Lack of response when issues are reported (2%)

Of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- 37% reported having faced challenges related to food assistance.

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
**MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET**

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).^1^  

![Bar chart showing the distribution of households below SMEB, between SMEB and MEB, and above MEB.](chart)

- **Below SMEB:** 9% of households
- **Between SMEB and MEB:** 68% of households
- **Above MEB:** 23% of households

*Including imputed amount of assistance*  
*Excluding imputed amount of assistance*

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

**LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES**

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.^2^

- **To access or pay for food:** 90% of households  
- **To access or pay for healthcare:** 39% of households  
- **To access or pay for education:** 17% of households  
- **To access or pay for clothes, shoes:** 16% of households  
- **To repair or build shelter:** 4% of households  
- **To pay for ceremonies:** 3% of households  
- **To access or pay for household items:** 3% of households

- **Adopted coping strategy**
  - Begging: 43%  
  - Borrowing money to buy food: 57%  
  - Spending savings: 66%  
  - Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 88%  
  - Selling household goods: 64%  
  - Selling productive assets or means of transport: 74%  
  - Selling labour in advance: 100%  
  - Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 100%  
  - Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 100%  
  - Entire household migrated: 100%  
  - Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 100%  
  - Child marriage: 99%  
  - Stress coping strategies: 59%  
  - Crisis coping strategies: 25%  
  - Emergency coping strategies: 1%

- **Exhausted coping strategy**
  - No need to adopt coping strategy

1. **In line with REVA.** SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3. Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4. Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5. Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6. Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

**% of households with a WASH LSG:** 43%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

**% of households per WASH LSG severity score:**

- Extreme (severity score 4): 2%
- Severe (severity score 3): 41%
- Stress (severity score 2): 22%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 35%
- Not classified: 0%

---

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 98% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 46% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

- 31%

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- 51%

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 38%
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 15%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 9%
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 6%
5. Reduce drinking water consumption: 6%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.

---

**WATER SOURCE**

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 58%
- Deep tubewell: 23%
- Shallow tubewell: 16%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 3%

---

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 98% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 46% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

- 31%

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- 51%

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 38%
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 15%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 9%
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 6%
5. Reduce drinking water consumption: 6%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 68%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 15%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 12%
- **VIP toilet**: 5%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females

- **21%**

#### Males

- **12%**

#### Top 5 reported problems

1. **Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded**
2. **Bathing facilities are too far**
3. **Bathing facilities are difficult to reach**
4. **Bathing facilities are not functioning**
5. **Lack of light inside bathing facilities**

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

1. **1 bin at household level**: 56%
2. **> 1 bin at household level**: 35%
3. **Access to communal bin/pit**: 11%
4. **None**: 2%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

1. **Bin at household level (segregated)**: 49%
2. **Bin at household level (not segregated)**: 36%
3. **Throws waste in the open**: 13%
4. **Communal bin/pit (segregated)**: 9%
5. **Communal bin/pit (not segregated)**: 1%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 113; households with males, n = 112). Households could select up to 5 options.
2. Households could select multiple options.
**EDUCATION**

**% of households with a education LSG:** 47%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

**% of households per education LSG severity score:**

- **4%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **44%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **30%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **19%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **4%** Not classified

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled in learning facilities** before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak

- **43%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled

- **45%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled

- **18%**

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021

- **44%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning

- **47%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning

- **18%**

**% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning**

- **56%**

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Children too old to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Lack of guidance from learning facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children too old to participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 97; households with boys, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 69 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^4\)

Top 5 reported challenges

Girls

Boys

9% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

11% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

9% Lack of structured schooling

2 Children have fallen too far behind on learning

9% Lack of qualified teaching staff

6% Lack of qualified teaching staff

7% Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility

5% Lack of quality learning materials

7% Children have fallen too far behind on learning

5% Lack of structured schooling

5% Lack of structured schooling

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

Girls

Boys

39% Marriage and/or pregnancy

20% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

10% Household does not consider education important

9% Children are too young still

3 Children are too old now

2 Marriage

4 Not enrolled in education pre-COPE/never enrolled

5 Children working outside the home

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

COPING

17% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^5\)

EXPERTURES

33% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 69 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 32%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 27% Severe (severity score 3)
- 18% Stress (severity score 2)
- 45% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 4% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative care</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities Men/boys</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities Women/girls</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities Men/boys</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities Women/girls</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities Men/boys</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby forests/open spaces or farms Men/boys</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation Women/girls</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby forests/open spaces or farms Men/boys</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CICs)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 32% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

#### PROTECTION NEEDS

68% of households reported needing protection services or support

- Improved safety and security in general: 41%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 24%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 20%
- Access to justice and mediation: 11%

Overall, 32% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
## NUTRITION

### % of households with a nutrition LSG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17% of households with a nutrition LSG. See Annex 1 for details on methodology.

### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILD NUTRITION

- 13% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021).
- 25% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.
- 33% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan.

### MESSAGING

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.

### OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan.

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

### CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 68% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.
- 59% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan.

### ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 16% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 111).

---

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.
% of households with a health LSG: 11%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 3)
- 11% Severe (severity score 2)
- 46% Stress (severity score 1)
- 42% None or minimal
- 0% Not classified

WELLBEING

55% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

88% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- 80% NGO clinic
- 28% Pharmacy or drug shop in the market
- 24% Private clinic
- 3% Traditional/ community healer
- 2% Government clinic

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location.

BARRIERS

The top 5 reported barriers are:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 28%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 18%
- Did not receive correct medications: 16%
- No functional health facility nearby: 6%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 3%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 68% 0 - < 20 min
- 25% 20 - 30 min
- 6% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (97%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (3%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 123). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

42% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 - 500</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500 - 1000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 - 2000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

39% of households reportedly having adopted **livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

34% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^1\).

31% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^2\).

33% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^3\).

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 25%, 23%, 26%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 16%, 14%, 17%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 9%, 7%, 6%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 5%, 2%, 9%
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 5%, 4%, 2%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 2%, 5%, NA
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 2%, 0%, 2%

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 92%
- No: 7%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 18%
- Latrines (males): 15%
- Bathing facilities (females): 13%
- Health care: 8%
- Bathing facilities (males): 6%
- Food assistance: 3%
- Learning facilities (girls): 2%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Health care: 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 113; n, latrines (males) = 112; n, bathing facilities (females) = 113; n, bathing facilities (males) = 112; n, learning facilities (girls) = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 39 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 114; n, food assistance = 114). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

61% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

16% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:
- No door to door information sharing: 5%
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 4%
- The information shared is irrelevant/no new information is shared: 3%
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 3%
- Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information: 3%

61% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 56%
- Livelihoods: 46%
- Site management/development: 39%
- Shelter: 32%
- Remote education: 30%
- Protection services: 27%
- Health services: 15%
- Water: 11%
- Nutrition services: 7%
- Food assistance: 4%
- Sanitation: 1%

98% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household's opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

73% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
4% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
2% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
11% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
9% Not consulted
2% Don't know / prefer not to answer

8% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

Top 5 reported challenges:
- The process was too complicated: 4%
- Language barriers: 3%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 3%
- Older persons face challenges providing feedback: 3%
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 90%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 19%
- Severe (severity score 3): 71%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 10%
- Not classified: 5%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 75%
- Food security & livelihoods: 71%
- WASH: 62%
- Education: 50%
- Protection: 40%
- Nutrition: 14%
- Health: 12%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Access to food: 61%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 56%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 36%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 30%
- Access to clean drinking water: 23%
- Household/cooking items: 23%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 14%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.77
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.27
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.60
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.56
5. Access to clean drinking water: 0.39
6. Household/cooking items: 0.37
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.24

POPULATION PROFILE

- Female (50%)
- Age: 60+ (1%)
- 25-59 (15%)
- 18-24 (9%)
- 12-17 (8%)
- 5-11 (13%)
- 0-4 (9%)
- Male (50%)
- Gender of head of household:
  - Female: 28%
  - Male: 72%
- Gender of respondent:
  - Female: 29%
  - Male: 71%

- Total number of household interviews: 124

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 111).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 74%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 74% Severe (severity score 3)
- 16% Stress (severity score 2)
- 10% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

- 73% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 71%
- Limited ventilation 34%
- Lack of insulation from cold 12%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 10%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 6%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 96%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 21%
- Materials trap heat 15%

% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
  - Replaced tarpaulin 35%
  - Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 27%
  - Tied down the roof/shelter 19%
  - Installed bracing 5%
  - Repaired the walls 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 59%
- No money to pay for materials 52%
- No money to pay for labour 8%
- Materials are unavailable 6%
- No need to improve 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

- 72% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 62% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 91). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
RENT PAYMENT

7% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 85%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 75%
- Shoes: 56%
- Mosquito nets: 52%
- Blankets: 48%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 44%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 37%
- Kitchen sets: 35%

54% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

COOKING FUEL

94% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

34% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

94% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

55% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 6%
- To pay electricity bill/or solar batteries: 1%
- To access or pay for household items: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

% of households with a food security LSG: 66%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 10% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 56% Severe (severity score 3)
- 31% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 3% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 8% Poor
- 52% Borderline
- 40% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

98% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 2% None
- 7% > 0 - 500
- 6% > 500 - 1000
- 19% > 1000 - 2000
- 50% > 2000 - 5000
- 18% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

64% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

- 57% Food items do not last until next distribution
- 5% Long queues at distribution points
- 4% Items received through distributions are less preferred
- 4% Items received through distributions are of low quality
- 3% Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- 3% Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
- 2% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site

LIVELIHOODS

65% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

- To access or pay for food 93%
- To access or pay for healthcare 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes 17%
- To repair or build shelter 12%
- To access or pay for education 11%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel 6%
- To pay ticket/cover travel for migration 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

- Stress coping strategies3, 4 66%
- Crisis coping strategies3, 5 23%
- Emergency coping strategies3, 6 0%

1 In line with REVA4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g., blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 60%  
see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 96% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 47% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

- 44% of households reported having reduced water consumption for purposes other than drinking
- 34% of households reported fetching water at a source further than the usual one
- 24% of households reported relying on less preferred water sources for drinking water
- 22% of households reported mixing safe and unsafe water for drinking
- 11% of households reported reducing water consumption for purposes other than drinking
- 9% of households reported relying on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking

WATER SOURCE

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow tubewell</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep tubewell</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 54%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 26%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 16%
- **VIP toilet**: 3%
- **Bucket toilet and put in latrine after**: 1%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females

- **Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding**: 46%
- **Latrines are unclean/unhygienic**: 21%
- **Latrines are too far**: 12%
- **Lack of light inside latrines**: 10%
- **Lack of light outside latrines**: 9%

#### Males

- **Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding**: 43%
- **Latrines are unclean/unhygienic**: 21%
- **Latrines are too far**: 11%
- **Lack of light inside latrines**: 8%
- **Lack of light outside latrines**: 8%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- **1 bin at household level**: 51%
- **> 1 bin at household level**: 31%
- **Access to communal bin/pit**: 31%
- **None**: 4%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- **Bin at household level**: 52%
- **Bin at household level (not segregated)**: 35%
- **Throws waste in the open**: 9%
- **Communal bin/pit (segregated)**: 25%
- **Communal bin/pit (not segregated)**: 5%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 124; households with males, n = 120). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 50%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 46% Severe (severity score 3)
- 31% Stress (severity score 2)
- 17% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 40%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 29%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 52%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 41%

Girls
- 24% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 15% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 8% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 7% Household does not consider education important
- 6% No home-based learning offered

Boys
- 22% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 8% Children too young to participate
- 7% No home-based learning offered
- 6% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 6% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 98). Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 111; households with boys, n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

52% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

55% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

33% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)

Girls

Boys

Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

43%

35%

Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

29%

43%

Marriage and/or pregnancy

Children are too old now

21%

21%

Household does not consider education important

Household does not consider education important

13%

13%

Children are too old now

Children are too young still

17%

6%

13%

13%

6%

11% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

12% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

2% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

Children are too old now

4%

3%

Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility

Children are too young still

2%

1%

Learning facilities overcrowded

No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

2%

1%

Household does not consider education important

Children needed to help at home

2%

1%

Household does not consider education important

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back.

Girls

Boys

19%

19%

Top 5 reported challenges

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

2. No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

3. Children are too old now

4. Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility

5. Learning facilities overcrowded

COPING

11% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

32% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 98).
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 82 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 73 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**PROTECTION**

% of households with a protection LSG: 38%  
see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (1)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

35% of households reported perceiving that **needs of children in their community were not adequately met** to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative care</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting **areas considered unsafe** by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9% of households reported the **safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated** compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
# POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Would Send</th>
<th>Would Not Send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Households could select multiple options.

# PROTECTION NEEDS

60% of households reported needing protection services or support

- Improved safety and security in general: 49%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 12%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 12%
- Access to justice and mediation: 1%

Overall, 38% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 15%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 15% Severe (severity score 3)
- 6% Stress (severity score 2)
- 79% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 15% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)¹

- 27% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

- 17% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan²

MESSAGING

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

OVERALL REACH

- 92% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan¹

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

- 62% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan¹

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 28% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan²

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
² The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 123).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:** 10%

*See Annex 1 for details on methodology*

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- Severe (severity score 3): 10%
- Stress (severity score 2): 45%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 44%
- Not classified: 0%

**WELLBEING**

- 54% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

- 83% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

**BARRIERS**

- 48% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 27%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 21%
- No functional health facility nearby: 9%
- Did not receive correct medications: 8%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 6%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 0 - < 20 min: 68%
  - 20 - 30 min: 28%
  - > 30 min: 4%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (97%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (3%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 133). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

36% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- None: 64%
- > 0 - 500: 35%
- > 500 - 1000: 1%

COPING

30% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- of households with adult women reported that **adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

- of households with adult men reported that **adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

- of households with children reported that **children in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

Most commonly reported challenges

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 25% (22%, 29%)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 12% (12%, 8%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 8% (9%, 6%)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 3% (2%, NA)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 3% (3%, 3%)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 2% (3%, 2%)
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1% (2%, 2%)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives

- Yes: 89%
- No: 10%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 2%

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting **services being too far** as one of the main barriers towards accessing them

- Latrines (females): 17%
- Latrines (males): 15%
- Health care: 12%
- Bathing facilities (males): 10%
- Bathing facilities (females): 8%
- Food assistance: 3%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting **inaccessibility** as one of the main barriers towards accessing them

- Latrines (females): 6%
- Latrines (males): 5%
- Bathing facilities (females): 3%
- Bathing facilities (males): 2%
- Health care: 1%

Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%

\[1\] The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 124). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

\[2\] The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options.

\[3\] The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 117). Households could select up to 5 options.

\[4\] The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 124; n, latrines (males) = 120; n, bathing facilities (females) = 124; n, bathing facilities (males) = 120; n, learning facilities (girls) = 80 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, health care = 124; n, food assistance = 122). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**ACCESSING INFORMATION**

82% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- **Non-food items**: 64%
- **Livelihoods**: 53%
- **Shelter**: 33%
- **Site management/development**: 27%
- **Remote education**: 26%
- **Protection services**: 17%
- **Health services**: 16%
- **Nutrition services**: 15%
- **Water**: 9%
- **Sanitation**: 6%
- **Food assistance**: 3%

19% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 12%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 3%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 2%
- No door to door information sharing: 2%
- Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information: 2%

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid**: 58%
- **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality**: 8%
- **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both**: 16%
- **Consulted but opinion not taken into account**: 13%
- **Not consulted**: 3%
- **Don’t know / prefer not to answer**: 2%

10% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 6%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 4%
- The process was too complicated: 2%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 2%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 74%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- 20% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 54% Severe (severity score 3)
- 1% Stress (severity score 2)
- 0% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 25% Not classified

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Food security & livelihoods 68%
- WASH 68%
- Shelter & non-food items 65%
- Education 58%
- Protection 43%
- Nutrition 8%
- Health 3%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Shelter materials/upgrade 59%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries 53%
- Access to food 46%
- Access to clean drinking water 33%
- Access to self-reliance activities 27%
- Access to safe and functional latrines 20%
- Household/cooking items 20%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Shelter materials/upgrade 1.45
2. Access to food 1.24
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries 1.08
4. Access to clean drinking water 0.51
5. Access to self-reliance activities 0.48
6. Access to safe and functional latrines 0.40
7. Household/cooking items 0.25

Average household size 5.4 persons

Gender of head of household:

- 26% Female
- 74% Male

Gender of respondent:

- 33% Female
- 67% Male

Total number of household interviews 104

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 42). Results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

63% of households reported at least one shelter issue

- Most commonly reported issues:
  - Leaks during rain 56%
  - Limited ventilation 20%
  - Lack of insulation from cold 15%
  - Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 10%
  - Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof 88%
- Damage to walls 14%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 11%

35% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

29% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

40% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

- Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
  - Replaced tarpaulin 38%
  - Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 24%
  - Tied down the roof/shelter 10%
  - Installed bracing 6%
  - Repaired/upgraded the windows and/or doors 4%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 55%
- No money to pay for materials 27%
- No money to pay for labour 5%
- Good quality materials are too expensive 2%
- No need to improve 42%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

- 81% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 64% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 42). Results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

RENT PAYMENT

0% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COOKING FUEL

100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection

38% of households reported receiving LPG refills that always lasted until the next distribution.

Of households reportedly not receiving LPG refills or receiving LPG refills that did not last, 38% reported using alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):

- Bought firewood 77%
- Bought LPG refills 17%
- Collected firewood 9%

62% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To pay electricity bill for solar batteries: 8%
- To repair or build shelter: 5%
- To access or pay for household items: 2%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 15% Poor
- 37% Borderline
- 48% Acceptable

% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection:
- Top 7 reported challenges:
  - Food items do not last until next distribution: 34%
  - Long queues at distribution points: 7%
  - Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 6%
  - Items received through distribution are less preferred: 5%
  - Items received through distribution are of low quality: 5%
  - Lack of clarity on food entitlement: 3%
  - Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 1%

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- None: 3%
- > 0 - 500: 5%
- > 500 - 1000: 7%
- > 1000 - 2000: 12%
- > 2000 - 5000: 64%
- > 5000: 10%

% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection:
- 97%

% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection:
- 83%

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- 64% Below SMEB
- 24% Between SMEB and MEB
- 78% Above MEB

• Including imputed amount of assistance
• Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

To access or pay for food 91%
To access or pay for healthcare 23%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 17%
To access or pay for education 8%
To access or pay for electricity bill/solar batteries 8%
To repair or build shelter 5%
To access or pay for agricultural inputs 2%

• Adopted coping strategy
• Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection3

- Borrowing money to buy food 48%
- Buying food on credit 42%
- Spending savings 28%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations 10%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance 1%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money 1%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures 2%
- Selling jewelry/gold 1%
- Selling household goods 1%
- Selling labour in advance 1%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport 1%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions 1%
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions 1%
- Entire household migrated 1%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs 1%
- Child marriage 1%
- Begging 1%

• Exhusted coping strategy
• No need to adopt coping strategy

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 62%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 4%
- Severe (severity score 3): 58%
- Stress (severity score 2): 7%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 23%
- Not classified: 9%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 98% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 45% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

- 34% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Drinking: 11%
- Cooking: 13%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 17%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 20%
- Other domestic purposes: 26%

COPING

- 47% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water.

Top 5 reported strategies:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 37%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 15%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 8%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 7%
- Reduce drinking water consumption: 2%

WATER SOURCE

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4):

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 45%
- Shallow tubewell: 34%
- Deep tubewell: 15%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 6%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 69%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 20%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 10%
- VIP toilet: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 26%
Males: 25%

Top 5 reported problems:
1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 14%
2. Latrines are too far: 11%
3. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 10%
4. Latrines are not functioning: 8%
5. Lack of light inside latrines: 5%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 13%
Males: 12%

Top 5 reported problems:
1. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 5%
2. Bathing facilities are not functioning: 5%
3. Bathing facilities are too far: 5%
4. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 3%
5. Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 3%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 88%
- > 1 bin at household level: 8%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 21%
- None: 1%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 66%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 26%
- Throws waste in the open: 12%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 19%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 4%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 103; households with males, n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 52%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 47% Severe (severity score 3)
- 16% Stress (severity score 2)
- 17% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 14% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

- 59% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

  - 58% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.
  - 39% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

- 63% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

  - 67% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
  - 42% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

- 59% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefiting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.

  - Top 5 reported challenges/reasons:
    - **Girls**
      - 18% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
      - 9% Marriage and/or pregnancy
      - 8% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
      - 4% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
      - 4% Children too old to participate

  - **Boys**
    - 20% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 7% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
    - 6% Lack of light in shelter
    - 5% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
    - 5% Household is unaware of home-based learning opportunities or how to access them

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 82 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
### EDUCATION

#### SENDING BACK

- **59%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)
- **62%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)
- **34%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)
- **% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)**\(^4\)
  - **Girls**
    - **29%** Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - **27%** Children are too old now
    - **21%** Marriage and/or pregnancy
    - **13%** Household does not consider education important
    - **2%** Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility
  - **Boys**
    - **31%** Children are too old now
    - **29%** Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - **14%** Household does not consider education important
    - **10%** Marriage
    - **8%** Children working outside the home

#### COPING

- **8%** of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^5\)

#### EXPENDITURES

- **23%** of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 49 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 34%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 29% Severe (severity score 3)
- 5% Stress (severity score 2)
- 47% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 14% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

22% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Education: 12%
- Food: 11%
- Safe areas for playing: 10%
- Shelter: 9%
- Health care: 4%
- Safety and security: 3%
- Alternative care: 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Top 5 reported areas for women/girls:

- Latrines or bathing facilities: 18%
- Markets: 13%
- Distribution sites: 11%
- Water points: 10%
- Social/community areas: 6%

Top 5 reported areas for men/boys:

- Latrines or bathing facilities: 15%
- In transportation: 13%
- Markets: 11%
- Distribution sites: 10%
- On their way to different facilities: 6%

9% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / prefer not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Would send*

*Would not send*

---

### PROTECTION NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting type of support needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, **60%** of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 9%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

- 8% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- 17% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 21% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

MESSENGING

- 94% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

OVERALL REACH

- 98% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 94% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 67% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 32% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 97).
% of households with a health LSG: 3%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 3% Severe (severity score 3)
- 36% Stress (severity score 2)
- 60% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

WELLBEING

47% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

90% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 71%
- Private clinic: 30%
- Government clinic: 19%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 15%
- Traditional/community healer: 7%

BARRIERS

26% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 21%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 9%
- Did not receive correct medications: 5%
- No functional health facility nearby: 4%
- Older persons face difficulties accessing health facility: 2%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 77%
- 20 - 30 min: 18%
- > 30 min: 5%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (92%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (6%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- None: 72%
- > 0 - 500: 27%
- > 500 - 1000: 0%
- > 1000: 1%
- > 2000: 1%

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 17% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 19% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- 19% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 17%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 7%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 4%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 3%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 2%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 1%

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 94% of households reported feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 12% of households using specific services reported services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.
- 4% of households using specific services reported inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 98). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 103; n, latrines (males) = 102; n, bathing facilities (females) = 103; n, bathing facilities (males) = 102; n, learning facilities (girls) = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 44 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 103; n, food assistance = 102). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 82% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- % of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:
  - Non-food items: 62%
  - Site management/development: 48%
  - Livelihoods: 47%
  - Remote education: 28%
  - Protection services: 28%
  - Shelter: 27%
  - Health services: 14%
  - Nutrition services: 13%
  - Water: 11%
  - Sanitation: 10%
  - Food assistance: 0%

- 12% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 5 reported problems:
  - Aid workers do not share/disclose: 7%
  - Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 5%
  - The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 4%
  - No door to door information sharing: 3%
  - Information isn't shared often enough: 1%

- 99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- % of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 53%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 15%
  - Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 14%
  - Not consulted: 4%
  - Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 4%

- 7% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 5 reported challenges:
  - No response/reaction received to feedback: 4%
  - Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 3%
  - Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 3%
  - Don’t know how to read/write: 2%
  - Asked for money when providing feedback: 2%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 82%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 25%
- Severe (severity score 3): 57%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 18%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 79%
- Food security & livelihoods: 73%
- WASH: 57%
- Education: 49%
- Protection: 33%
- Nutrition: 19%
- Health: 8%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked)
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 67%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 50%
- Access to food: 39%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 39%
- Household/cooking items: 27%
- Access to clean drinking water: 18%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 17%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score
1. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.69
2. Access to food: 1.09
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.92
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.68
5. Household/cooking items: 0.35
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.31
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.27

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 5.0 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 18%
- Male: 82%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp
- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 6%
- After 24 August 2017: 94%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 7%
- Male: 93%

Total number of household interviews: 102

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 77%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

78% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain 73%
- Limited ventilation 35%
- Lack of insulation from cold 15%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 9%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof 95%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 18%
- Damage to walls 16%

46% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

25% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

40% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
- Replaced tarpaulin 29%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 18%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 17%
- Repaired the walls 8%
- Installed bracing 7%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 74%
- No money to pay for materials 44%
- No money to pay for labour 11%
- Materials are unavailable 5%
- No need to improve 21%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:
- 76% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 66% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves
Rent Payment

1% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Non-Food Items

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 94%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 78%
- Shoes: 71%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 58%
- Blankets: 48%
- Kitchen sets: 46%
- Mosquito nets: 40%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 36%

COOKING FUEL

99% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

37% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 71%
- Collected firewood: 23%
- Bought LPG refills: 20%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

55% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

64% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Coping

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 15%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 10%
- To pay electricity bill/for solar batteries: 8%
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 67%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 19% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 48% Severe (severity score 3)
- 32% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 1% Not classified

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 17% Poor
- 40% Borderline
- 43% Acceptable

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 1% None
- 4% > 0 - 500
- 9% > 500 - 1000
- 22% > 1000 - 2000
- 55% > 2000 - 5000
- 10% > 5000

% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection:
- 42% Food items do not last until next distribution
- 31% Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- 15% Items received through distributions are of low quality
- 7% Long queues at distribution points
- 6% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site
- 5% Distribution points are too far/far lack of transport
- 4% Harassment of women/girls at distribution sites

% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection:
- 99%

% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection:
- 75%

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...  
- stress coping strategies3,4 68%
- crisis coping strategies3,5 23%
- emergency coping strategies3,6 1%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and gifts, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).  
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.  
3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.  
4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.  
5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; shelter maintenance or repair; entire household migrated.  
6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 56%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 5%
- Severe (severity score 3): 51%
- Stress (severity score 2): 8%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 32%
- Not classified: 4%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 100% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 48% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

- 28% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Cooking: 10%
- Drinking: 11%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 18%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 20%
- Other domestic purposes: 22%

COPING

- 49% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water.

Top 5 reported strategies:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 37%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 17%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 11%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 9%
- Reduce drinking water consumption: 6%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 3)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 65%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 21%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 15%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- **Females**: 34%
- **Males**: 28%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- **Females**: 18%
- **Males**: 15%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 63%
- > 1 bin at household level: 25%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 18%
- None: 4%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 51%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 34%
- Throws waste in the open: 12%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 18%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 5%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 98; households with males, n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 44%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

42% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.1

42% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.2

20% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.3

HOME-BASED LEARNING

45% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.1

44% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.4

25% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.5

Girls

55%

Boys

46%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance from learning facilitators</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

40% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

42% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

16% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:

Girls

33% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

32% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

19% Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility

12% Lack of gender segregation at learning facility

9% Lack of gender-segregated latrines at learning facility

Top 5 reported challenges

COPING

12% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

25% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 45). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.

3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 40 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 45 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 28%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 25% Severe (severity score 3)
- 11% Stress (severity score 2)
- 51% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 10% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

40% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Education 27%
- Safe areas for playing 16%
- Food 13%
- Safety and security 7%
- Shelter 6%
- Health care 5%
- Psychosocial support 4%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/girls: 12%
Men/boys: 10%

Top 5 reported areas:

- Women/girls: Latrines or bathing facilities (11%), Markets (9%), In transportation (5%), Distribution sites (3%), Water points (3%)
- Men/boys: Latrines or bathing facilities (8%), Markets (6%), In transportation (5%), Distribution sites (3%), Nearby forests/open spaces or farms (2%)

13% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Majhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CICs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Health facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Households could select multiple options.*

#### PROTECTION NEEDS

- % of households reporting where they would or would not **send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse**, by point-of-contact:

  - Majhi: 80% (send), 3% (would not send)
  - Camps-in-Charge (CICs): 80% (send), 2% (would not send)
  - Law enforcement officials: 30% (send), 5% (would not send)
  - Health facilities: 28% (send), 1% (would not send)
  - Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 24% (send), 2% (would not send)
  - Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 14% (send), 4% (would not send)
  - Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 11% (send), 2% (would not send)
  - Legal aid service providers: 7% (send), 1% (would not send)
  - Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 6% (send), 1% (would not send)
  - Psychosocial service providers: 5% (send), 6% (would not send)
  - None: 75% (would not send), 1% (would not send)
  - Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 8% (would not send)

Overall, **50% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact**, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 19%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 18% Severe (severity score 3)
- 1% Stress (severity score 2)
- 80% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 6% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)¹

- 29% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

- 29% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan¹

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 87% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 14% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan²

MESSAGING

- 92% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan¹

OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan¹

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and receiving messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
² The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 92).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:** 9%

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- 9% Severe (severity score 3)
- 34% Stress (severity score 2)
- 56% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**WELLBEING**

49% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

84% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic¹.

**BARRIERS**

34% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care².

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 23%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 16%
- Did not receive correct medications: 8%
- No functional health facility nearby: 6%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 3%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 0 - < 20 min: 79%
  - 20 - 30 min: 19%
  - > 30 min: 2%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (95%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (2%).

---

¹ The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 93). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

² Households could select up to 3 options.
**Health**

**Expenditures**

33% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range (BDT)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 - 500</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500 - 1000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 - 2000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2000 - 5000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coping**

28% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.¹

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- **29%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection
- **25%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection
- **27%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection

Most commonly reported challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 90%
- No: 9%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Bathing facilities (females): 10%
- Health care: 8%
- Latrines (females): 8%
- Latrines (males): 6%
- Food assistance: 4%
- Bathing facilities (males): 4%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (males): 6%
- Latrines (females): 6%
- Bathing facilities (males): 4%
- Bathing facilities (females): 4%
- Food assistance: 1%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Health care: 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 98). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 88). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 98; n, latrines (males) = 102; n, bathing facilities (females) = 98; n, bathing facilities (males) = 102; n, learning facilities (girls) = 50 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 35 - results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.; n, health care = 102; n, food assistance = 102). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
July - August 2021

COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 77% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 21% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 11%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 7%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 6%
- No door to door information sharing: 6%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 3%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 68% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 13% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- No response/reaction received to feedback: 7%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/limely: 7%
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 5%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 3%
- No female staff collecting/receiving feedback: 3%

Notes:
1. Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2. Households could select up to 3 options.
3. Households could select up to 5 options.
### Multi-Sectoral Needs & Demographics

#### % of Households with Multi-Sectoral Needs:

- **80%**

#### % of Households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) Severity Score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or Minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % of Households with Sectoral Living Standard Gaps (LSGs) among Households with Multi-Sectoral Needs:

- **Food security & livelihoods**: 91%
- **Shelter & non-food items**: 75%
- **WASH**: 55%
- **Education**: 38%
- **Protection**: 32%
- **Nutrition**: 16%
- **Health**: 14%

#### Priority Needs

- **Shelter materials/upgrade**: 70%
- **Access to food**: 62%
- **Access to self-reliance activities**: 33%
- **Electricity/solar lamps/batteries**: 29%
- **Household/cooking items**: 25%
- **Access to clean drinking water**: 14%
- **Access to protection services**: 12%

#### POPULATION PROFILE

- **Female (50%)**
- **Age**: 60+ (1%)
- **Male (50%)**
- **Age**: 25-59 (15%)
- **Female**: 70%
- **Shelter materials/upgrade**: 14%
- **Access to food**: 62%
- **Access to self-reliance activities**: 33%
- **Electricity/solar lamps/batteries**: 29%
- **Household/cooking items**: 25%
- **Access to clean drinking water**: 14%
- **Access to protection services**: 12%

#### Average household size: 5.2 persons

#### Gender of Head of Household:

- **Female**: 15%
- **Male**: 83%
- **Other**: 2%

#### Gender of Respondent:

- **Female**: 18%
- **Male**: 80%
- **Other**: 2%

#### Total number of household interviews: 109

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/− 11% margin of error.
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
July - August 2021

SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 76%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 75% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 12% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

75% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 72%
- Limited ventilation 17%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 5%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 3%
- Lack of insulation from cold 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 96%
- Materials trap heat 14%
- Damage to walls 10%

42% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

32% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

37% of households reportedly having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin 35%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 12%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 12%
- Installed bracing 6%
- Repaired the walls 6%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 68%
- No money to pay for materials 43%
- Materials are unavailable 16%
- No money to pay for labour 13%
- No need to improve 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 35% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 85% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 81). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 40). Results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.
**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

### RENT PAYMENT

- **11%** of households reported having had to **pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

- **Fans** 94%
- **Shoes** 80%
- **Torch/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels** 72%
- **Clothing and winter clothing** 57%
- **Mosquito nets** 51%
- **Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items** 45%
- **Kitchen sets** 40%
- **Blankets** 30%

**NON-FOOD ITEMS**

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- **Fans** 94%
- **Shoes** 80%
- **Torch/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels** 72%
- **Clothing and winter clothing** 57%
- **Mosquito nets** 51%
- **Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items** 45%
- **Kitchen sets** 40%
- **Blankets** 30%

### COOKING FUEL

- **97%** of households reported having **received LPG refills** from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- **48%** of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills **always lasted until the next distribution**.

  % of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

  - **Bought firewood** 52%
  - **Collected firewood** 47%
  - **Bought LPG refills** 12%
  - **Shelter materials used as firewood** 2%

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted **livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes 17%
- To repair or build shelter 6%
- To access or pay for household items 5%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 106).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
**FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS**

% of households with a food security LSG: 87%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology.

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 11% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 76% Severe (severity score 3)
- 10% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 3% Not classified

**FOOD CONSUMPTION**

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 4% Poor
- 69% Borderline
- 28% Acceptable

**FOOD EXPENDITURE**

99% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 4% > 0 - 500
- 13% > 500 - 1000
- 27% > 1000 - 2000
- 44% > 2000 - 5000
- 12% > 5000

**FOOD ASSISTANCE**

37% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution (35%)
2. Items received through distributions are of low quality (4%)
3. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site (3%)
4. Lack of space to safely store food in shelter (1%)
5. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (1%)

**LIVELIHOODS**

56% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

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

2. Households could select up to 5 options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To access or pay for food</th>
<th>To access or pay for healthcare</th>
<th>To access or pay for clothes, shoes</th>
<th>To repair or build shelter</th>
<th>To access or pay for education</th>
<th>To access or pay for household items</th>
<th>To pay for ceremonies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/ money; adults working long hours in hazardous conditions. 

Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

\(^3\) Stress coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

\(^4\) Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/ money; adults working long hours in hazardous conditions.

\(^5\) Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

\(^6\) Excluding imputed amount of assistance.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 57%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- 57% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 55% Severe (severity score 3)
- 16% Stress (severity score 2)
- 26% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 97% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- 51% of households reported spending money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES
- 32% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

WATER SOURCE
- 50% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 3):
  - Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
  - Deep tubewell
  - Shallow tubewell

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 49% None
- 44% > 0 - 500
- 4% > 500 - 1000
- 3% > 1000 - 2000
- 1% > 2000 - 5000

COPING
- 66% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:
- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one 61%
- Reduce drinking water consumption 13%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking 12%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water 6%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking 1%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
## Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH)

### Sanitation Facilities

**% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush or pour/flush toilet</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with a slab and platform</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without a slab or platform</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP toilet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bathing Facilities

**% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light inside latrines</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines too far</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light outside latrines</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top 5 reported problems

1. Lack of light inside latrines
2. Latrines too far
3. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding
4. Lack of light outside latrines
5. Latrines are difficult to reach

### Bathing Facilities

**% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wasting Management

**% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to bins</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bin at household level (segregated)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bin at household level (not segregated)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 bin at household level</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit (segregated)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit (not segregated)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Method</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (segregated)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (not segregated)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrown waste in the open</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 107; households with males, n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.
2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 35%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 33% Severe (severity score 3)
- 25% Stress (severity score 2)
- 27% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 14% Not classified

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

- 39% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak

- 38% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled

- 17% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

- 39% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021

- 40% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning

- 17% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning

**Top 5 reported challenges/reasons**

**Girls**
- 12% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 12% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 7% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
- 6% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 4% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators

**Boys**
- 10% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 7% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 7% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
- 6% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 5% Lack of light in shelter

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

**SENDING BACK**

- **35%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)
- **36%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)
- **17%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households is unaware of education opportunities available or how to access them</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children have fallen too far behind on learning</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

5% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^6\)

**EXPENDITURES**

36% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

\(1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

\(2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 41 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 29%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%
- Severe (severity score 3): 27%
- Stress (severity score 2): 13%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 47%
- Not classified: 11%

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

41% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Education: 31%
- Safe areas for playing: 16%
- Safety and security: 12%
- Food: 4%
- Health care: 4%
- Alternative care: 3%
- Psychosocial support: 2%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Women/girls:
  - Markets: 3%
  - Social/community areas: 1%
  - On their way to different facilities: 1%
  - Distribution sites: 1%
  - In own shelter (at home): 1%
- Men/boys:
  - Markets: 3%
  - Social/community areas: 1%
  - On their way to different facilities: 1%

5% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Footnote: Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- Majhi: 75% Would send, 3% Would not send
- Camps-in-Charge (CiCs): 64% Would send, 4% Would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 21% Would send, 2% Would not send
- Health facilities: 17% Would send, 1% Would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 17% Would send, 3% Would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 17% Would send, 12% Would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 15% Would send, 7% Would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 6% Would send, 2% Would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 3% Would send, 2% Would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 1% Would send, 5% Would not send
- None: 57% Would send, 0% Would not send
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 0% Would send, 16% Would not send

Overall, 44% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 19%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 17% Severe (severity score 3)
- 6% Stress (severity score 2)
- 74% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 9% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 29% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 32% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 57% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 94% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 10% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 104).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: **16%**

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 16% Severe (severity score 3)
- 36% Stress (severity score 2)
- 48% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**WELLBEING**

47% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

81% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic: 77%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 52%
- Private clinic: 16%
- Traditional/ community healer: 5%
- Government clinic: 1%

**BARRIERS**

40% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded: 25%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 19%
- Did not receive correct medications: 13%
- No functional health facility nearby: 4%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility: 4%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- 74% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation.

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (97%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (3%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 106). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
None of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

49% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- None: 51%
- > 0 - 500: 45%
- > 500 - 1000: 4%

43% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

### MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **30%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^1\)

- **25%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^2\)

- **35%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^3\)

**Most commonly reported challenges**

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 20%\(\pm 19\%\)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 11%\(\pm 10\%\)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 8%\(\pm 8\%\)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 4%\(\pm 6\%\)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 1%\(\pm 0\%\)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 1%\(\pm 0\%\)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 1%\(\pm 0\%\)

### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 96%
- No: 4%

### ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them\(^4\):

- Bathing facilities (females): 20%
- Bating facilities (males): 16%
- Latrines (females): 13%
- Latrines (males): 12%
- Health care: 6%
- Food assistance: 0%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (males): 8%
- Latrines (females): 7%
- Bathing facilities (females): 3%
- Bathing facilities (males): 1%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%
- Health care: 0%

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 97). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 101). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 107; n, latrines (males) = 105; n, bathing facilities (females) = 107; n, bathing facilities (males) = 105; n, learning facilities (girls) = 43 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 28 - results are representative with a +/- 19% margin of error.; n, health care = 108; n, food assistance = 109). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

53% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 42%
- Shelter: 30%
- Livelihoods: 26%
- Remote education: 15%
- Site management/development: 10%
- Nutrition services: 9%
- Water: 6%
- Protection services: 6%
- Health services: 2%
- Food assistance: 0%
- Sanitation: 0%

29% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 17%
- No door to door information sharing: 7%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 4%
- Information isn't shared often enough: 1%
- Not enough information on services available: 1%

98% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 75%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 6%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 3%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 10%
- Not consulted: 6%

4% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 2%
- Language barriers: 1%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 1%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 1%
- Older persons face challenges providing feedback: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
Multi-sectoral needs & demographics

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 94%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 20%
- Severe (severity score 3): 74%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 6%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Food security & livelihoods: 74%
- Shelter & non-food items: 72%
- Education: 53%
- WASH: 28%
- Protection: 27%
- Nutrition: 14%
- Health: 5%

Priority needs

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Access to food: 63%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 62%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 44%
- Household/cooking items: 36%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 23%
- Clothing: 21%
- Access to health services/medicine: 13%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.76
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.34
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.84
4. Household/cooking items: 0.55
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.31
6. Clothing: 0.28
7. Access to education: 0.26

Population profile

Female (50%)
- Age:
  - 1%: 60+
  - 15%: 25-59
  - 7%: 18-24
  - 6%: 12-17
  - 12%: 5-11
  - 7%: 0-4
Male (50%)
- Age:
  - 2%: 60+
  - 15%: 25-59
  - 4%: 18-24
  - 5%: 12-17
  - 14%: 5-11
  - 11%: 0-4

Average household size: 5.4 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 11%
- Male: 89%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 4%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 8%
- After 24 August 2017: 88%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 18%
- Male: 82%

Total number of household interviews: 100

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 31). Results are representative with a +/- 18% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event on shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

72% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 65%
- Limited ventilation: 26%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 10%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 1%

65+26+10+1

72%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 90%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 17%
- Materials trap heat: 14%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 58%
- No money to pay for materials: 45%
- No money to pay for labour: 17%
- Materials are unavailable: 6%
- No need to improve: 35%

44% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

16% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

71% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation

48% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 Households could select multiple options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 31). Results are representative with a +/- 18% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 99). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 94%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 81%
- Shoes: 52%
- Blankets: 39%
- Mosquito nets: 39%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 34%
- Kitchen sets: 33%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 27%

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):

- Collected firewood: 57%
- Bought firewood: 43%
- Bought LPG refills: 11%

% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection: 41%

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To access or pay for household items: 2%
- To pay electricity bill/for solar batteries: 1%
- To repair or build shelter: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score³

- 7% Poor
- 52% Borderline
- 41% Acceptable

% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

- 66% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution (64%)
2. Long queues at distribution points (12%)
3. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport (4%)
4. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site (4%)
5. Items received through distributions are less preferred (3%)
6. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (2%)
7. Cannot carry assistance to shelter (2%)

% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

- 77%

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket). 1

- 69% Below SMEB
- 30% Between SMEB and MEB
- 67% Above MEB

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

To access or pay for food 96%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 23%
To access or pay for healthcare 13%
To access or pay for education 6%
To access or pay for household items 2%
To access or pay for agricultural inputs 1%
To access or pay for electricity bill/solar batteries 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

... stress coping strategies3,4 80%
... crisis coping strategies3,5 15%
... emergency coping strategies3,6 2%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 30%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%
- Severe (severity score 3): 27%
- Stress (severity score 2): 16%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 54%
- Not classified: 0%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 100% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 47% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection: 18%

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Cooking: 10%
- Drinking: 10%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 15%
- Other domestic purposes: 17%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 17%

COPING

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water: 44%

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 34%
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 9%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 7%
4. Mix safe and unsafe water for drinking: 6%
5. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 5%

WATER SOURCE

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 3):

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 73%
- Deep tubewell: 16%
- Shallow tubewell: 11%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 55%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 25%
- VIP toilet: 12%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 8%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 17%
- Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 6%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 5%
- Lack of light outside bathing facilities: 3%
- Latrines are too far: 2%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 2%

Males
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 15%
- Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 7%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 6%
- Lack of light outside bathing facilities: 5%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 46%
- > 1 bin at household level: 44%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 18%
- None: 1%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 43%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 48%
- Throws waste in the open: 3%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 16%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 1%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household faced, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household faced (households with females, n = 100; households with males, n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: **52%**

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- **6%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **46%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **25%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **21%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **2%** Not classified

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

- **42%** of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

  - **46%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.
  - **18%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

- **44%** of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

  - **51%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
  - **23%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- **68%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
- **58%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

**Top 5 reported challenges/ reasons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges/Reasons</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance from learning facilitators</td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children too young to participate</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children cannot concentrate at home</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 85 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 77 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

**SENDING BACK**

- **40%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.\(^1\)
- **46%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.\(^2\)
- **18%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.\(^3\)
- **% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\)**
  - **Girls**
    - Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (15%)
    - Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (41%)
    - Children are too young still (40%)
    - Children are too old now (19%)
    - Household does not consider education important (12%)
  - **Boys**
    - Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (18%)
    - Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (43%)
    - Children are too young still (23%)
    - Marriage (17%)
    - Children are too old now (17%)

**COPING**

- **6%** of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.\(^5\)

**EXPENDITURES**

- **31%** of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 30 - results are representative with a +/- 18% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 62 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**PROTECTION**

% of households with a protection LSG: **25%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

52% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Education: 46%
- Safe areas for playing: 18%
- Food: 10%
- Safety and security: 7%
- Alternative care: 4%
- Health care: 3%
- Shelter: 1%

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Top 5 reported areas for women/girls:
  - On their way to different facilities: 11%
  - Social/community areas: 5%
  - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 2%
  - In transportation: 1%
- Top 5 reported areas for men/boys:
  - Social/community areas: 2%
  - Markets: 5%
  - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 1%
  - On their way to different facilities: 2%
  - In transportation: 1%

6% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

1 Households could select multiple options.
Households could select multiple options.

### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

**% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact**

- **Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)**: 86%
- **Majhi**: 74%
- **Ombudsman/national human rights institutions**: 25%
- **Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms**: 21%
- **Health facilities**: 17%
- **Law enforcement officials**: 15%
- **Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres**: 12%
- **Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives**: 9%
- **Psychosocial service providers**: 3%
- **Legal aid service providers**: 1%
- **None**: 86%
- **Don’t know / prefer not to answer**: 0%

### PROTECTION NEEDS

**% of households reporting type of support needed**

- **Improved safety and security in general**: 64%
- **Improved safety and security for women and girls**: 22%
- **Mental health & psychosocial support**: 9%
- **Access to justice and mediation**: 8%

Overall, **46% of households reported needing protection services or support**

### PROTECTION NEEDS DIFFICULTIES

- **Overall, 46% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.**

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
**NUTRITION**

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 13%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 13% Severe (severity score 3)
- 10% Stress (severity score 2)
- 75% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

**CHILD NUTRITION**

- 12% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies** for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 20% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition** by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 18% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition** since the start of Ramadan

**MESSAGING**

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc.** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**OVERALL REACH**

- 100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers** since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**

- 85% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**

- 26% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported **at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets** since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 98).
% of households with a health LSG: 6%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 6% Severe (severity score 3)
- 31% Stress (severity score 2)
- 63% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

WELLBEING
- 59% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR
- 94% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic
- 59% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location

BARRIERS
- 58% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES
- 77% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation
  - 0 - < 20 min: 77%
  - 20 - 30 min: 22%
  - > 30 min: 1%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (96%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (4%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 100). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

39% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

![Chart showing % of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)](

- None: 61%
- > 0 - 500: 39%

**COPING**

13% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
## Site Management

### Mobility Around Camps

- **Of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection**: 8%  
- **Of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection**: 7%  
- **Of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection**: 20%

#### Most commonly reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Adult Women</th>
<th>Adult Men</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Representation

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 92%
- No: 6%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%
- Don’t have community representative: 1%

### Accessing Services

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Health care: 9%
- Bathing facilities (males): 6%
- Bathing facilities (females): 6%
- Food assistance: 4%
- Latrines (females): 3%
- Latrines (males): 2%

---

*The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.*

*The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 98). Households could select up to 5 options.*

*The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 97). Households could select up to 5 options.*

*The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 100; n, latrines (males) = 100; n, bathing facilities (females) = 100; n, bathing facilities (males) = 100; n, learning facilities (girls) = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 29 - results are representative with a +/- 19% margin of error.; n, health care = 100; n, food assistance = 100). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.*

---

1. Adult women
2. Adult men
3. Children
ACCESSION INFORMATION

83% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 69%
- Livelihoods: 38%
- Shelter: 37%
- Remote education: 28%
- Site management/development: 23%
- Nutrition services: 15%
- Protection services: 15%
- Health services: 7%
- Food assistance: 1%
- Water: 1%
- Sanitation: 1%

21% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 11%
- No door to door information sharing: 5%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 3%
- Information isn't shared often enough: 2%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%

94% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 60%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 12%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 16%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 5%
- Not consulted: 7%

9% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 6%
- The process was too complicated: 2%
- Language barriers: 1%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 1%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 1%
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 93%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 25%
- Severe (severity score 3): 68%
- Stress (severity score 2): 6%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 1%
- Not classified: 6%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 77%
- Food security & livelihoods: 62%
- Education: 51%
- WASH: 49%
- Protection: 38%
- Nutrition: 15%
- Health: 13%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.72
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.32
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.77
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.51
5. Households/cooking items: 0.34
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.30
7. Clothing: 0.25

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 20%
- Male: 80%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 18%
- Male: 82%

Average household size: 5.4 persons

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 5%
- After 24 August 2017: 95%

Total number of household interviews: 106

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 99).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 76%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 76% Severe (severity score 3)
- 10% Stress (severity score 2)
- 13% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

74% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain 72%
- Limited ventilation 26%
- Lack of insulation from cold 13%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof 95%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 19%
- Materials trap heat 10%

30% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

27% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
- Replaced tarpaulin 47%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 20%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 19%
- Repaired/upgraded the windows and/or doors 8%
- Repaired/upgraded the floor 7%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 54%
- No money to pay for materials 42%
- Materials are unavailable 10%
- No money to pay for labour 8%
- No need to improve 38%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:
- 74% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 59% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
of households reported having to **pay or exchange goods/labour** to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 93%
- Torches/handheld lights or solar lamps/panels: 61%
- Shoes: 56%
- Kitchen sets: 36%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 33%
- Mosquito nets: 28%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 25%
- Blankets: 22%

of households reported having incurred **expenditures** for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households among households reportedly having adopted **livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 12%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%

of households reported having **received LPG refills** from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills **always lasted until the next distribution**.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting **alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 5)**:

- Bought firewood: 54%
- Collected firewood: 35%
- Bought LPG refills: 19%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 1%
- Kerosene or other combustible: 0%

of households reported an **expenditure on fuel** in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 8% Poor
- 41% Borderline
- 52% Acceptable

% of households with a food security LSG: 60%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 12% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 48% Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 1% Not classified

Top 5 reported challenges related to food assistance:
1. Food items do not last until next distribution 51%
2. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport 3%
3. Items received through distributions are of low quality 1%
4. Long queues at distribution points 1%
5. Cannot carry assistance to shelter 1%

% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection: 94%

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 6% None
- 8% > 0 - 500
- 17% > 500 - 1000
- 50% > 1000 - 2000
- 19% > 2000 - 5000
- 19% > 5000

% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection: 62%

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).\(^1\)

- **Below SMEB**: 5%
- **Between SMEB and MEB**: 17%
- **Above MEB**: 78%

- **Including imputed amount of assistance**: 56%
- **Excluding imputed amount of assistance**: 25%

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 5) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.\(^2\)

- **To access or pay for food**: 95%
- **To access or pay for healthcare**: 24%
- **To access or pay for clothes, shoes**: 12%
- **To repair or build shelter**: 3%
- **To access or pay for education**: 1%

**Adopted coping strategy**

- **Exhausted coping strategy**

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.\(^3\)

- **Borrowing money to buy food**: 38%
- **Buying food on credit**: 50%
- **Spending savings**: 46%
- **Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations**: 21%
- **Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance**: 7%
- **Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money**: 5%
- **Reducing essential non-food expenditures**: 63%
- **Selling jewelry/gold**: 82%
- **Selling household goods**: 87%
- **Selling labour in advance**: 88%
- **Selling productive assets or means of transport**: 85%
- **Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions**: 100%
- **Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions**: 100%
- **Entire household migrated**: 100%
- **Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs**: 99%
- **Child marriage**: 99%
- **Begging**: 99%

1. In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g., blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).
2. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
3. Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.
4. Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.
5. Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fuel; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.
6. Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: 48%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 46% Severe (severity score 3)
- 22% Stress (severity score 2)
- 30% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**HYGIENE ITEMS**
- 99% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 40% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

**WATER QUANTITIES**
- 24% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:
- Cooking 11%
- Drinking 11%
- Personal hygiene at shelter 16%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location 16%
- Other domestic purposes 21%

**COPING**
- 36% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:
- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one 29%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking 6%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking 5%
- Mix safe and unsafe water for drinking 2%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water 1%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**SANITATION FACILITIES**

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 39%
- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 36%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 15%
- VIP toilet: 10%

- Households could select up to 5 options.

**BATHING FACILITIES**

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

**Female**

- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowded: 40%

- Latrines are difficult to reach: 11%

- Lack of light inside latrines: 11%

- Latrines are too far: 10%

- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 9%

**Male**

- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowded: 38%

- Latrines are difficult to reach: 12%

- Lack of light inside latrines: 8%

- Latrines are too far: 10%

- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 10%

- Households could select up to 5 options.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT**

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 64%
- > 1 bin at household level: 25%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 27%
- None: 6%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 46%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 35%
- Throws waste in the open: 16%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 24%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 2%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 106; households with males, n = 104). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 48%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 8% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 41% Severe (severity score 3)
- 34% Stress (severity score 2)
- 13% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 5% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak:

- 46% of households with at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled
- 45% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled
- 26% of households with at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled

HOME-BASED LEARNING

% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021:

- 47% of households with at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning
- 50% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning
- 28% of households with at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- Girls: 64%
- Boys: 56%

Top 5 reported challenges/ reasons:

- Girls:
  - 24% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 22% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 8% Household does not consider education important
  - 6% Children cannot concentrate at home
  - 5% Children too old to participate

- Boys:
  - 21% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 10% Children too young to participate
  - 9% Children too old to participate
  - 8% Marriage
  - 6% Children cannot concentrate at home

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 97; households with boys, n = 89 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

43% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

47% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

23% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):  
- **Girls**:  
  1. Marriage and/or pregnancy: 44%  
  2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 37%  
  3. Children are too old now: 23%  
  4. Children are too young still: 14%  
  5. Household does not consider education important: 11%  

- **Boys**:  
  1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 38%  
  2. Children are too old now: 23%  
  3. Children are too young still: 21%  
  4. Marriage: 19%  
  5. Children working outside the home: 9%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:

- **Girls**:  
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 11%  
  2. Children are too old now: 7%  
  3. Children are too young still: 4%  
  4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 2%  

- **Boys**:  
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 8%  
  2. Children are too old now: 7%  
  3. Children are too young still: 3%  
  4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 2%

COPING

1% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

25% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 70 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 36%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 11%
- Severe (severity score 3): 25%
- Stress (severity score 2): 9%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 55%
- Not classified: 0%

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.

- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.

- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 30% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

SAFETY & SECURITY

- % of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

  - Women/girls: 12%
  - Men/boys: 2%

  Top 5 reported areas:

  - Women/girls: On their way to different facilities (1), Markets (4), Latrines or bathing facilities (2), Social/community areas (3), Distribution sites (5).
  - Men/boys: Markets (1), Social/community areas (2), On their way to different facilities (3), In own shelter (at home) (4), Social/community areas (5).

- 4% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
**POINTS-OF-CONTACT**

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>% Would Send</th>
<th>% Would Not Send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don’t know / prefer not to answer                      | 0%           | 0%               |

- **Would send**
- **Would not send**

**PROTECTION NEEDS**

52% of households reported needing protection services or support:

- Improved safety and security in general: 42%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 15%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 6%
- Access to justice and mediation: 1%

Overall, 25% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
**NUTRITION**

**% of households with a nutrition LSG:**

14%

**see Annex 1 for details on methodology**

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 14% Severe (severity score 3)
- 6% Stress (severity score 2)
- 80% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

---

**CHILD NUTRITION**

- 7% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies** for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 22% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition** by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 25% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition** since the start of Ramadan

**MESSAGING**

- 94% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc.** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**OVERALL REACH**

- 100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers** since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**

- 82% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 78% of households reported **mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months** for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**

- 27% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported **at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets** since the start of Ramadan

---

The **mother-led MUAC programme** is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 104).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: **14%**

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 14% Severe (severity score 3)
- 27% Stress (severity score 2)
- 58% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**WELLBEING**

57% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

78% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:
- NGO clinic: 63%
- Private clinic: 25%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 20%
- Traditional/ community healer: 9%
- Government clinic: 4%

**BARRIERS**

52% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:
- Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded: 31%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 16%
- Did not receive correct medications: 12%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility: 10%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way: 8%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

79% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
- 0 - < 20 min: 79%
- 20 - 30 min: 20%
- > 30 min: 1%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (98%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (2%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 139). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

42% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 58% None
- 39% > 0 - 500
- 0% > 500 - 1000
- 2% > 1000 - 2000
- 1% > 2000 - 5000

COPING

24% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- **25%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

- **26%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

- **26%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

**Most commonly reported challenges**

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 23%, 22%, 22%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 15%, 16%, 19%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 6%, 6%, 5%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1%, 2%, 0%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 1%, 3%, NA

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

- **88%** of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

- **13%** of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 97). Households could select up to 5 options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 106; n, latrines (males) = 104; n, bathing facilities (females) = 106; n, bathing facilities (males) = 104; n, learning facilities (girls) = 70 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, health care = 105; n, food assistance = 106). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
## COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

### ACCESSING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>% of households reported not having been able to access information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understand) enough clear information, by type of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>enough clear information in the 6 months prior to data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the 6 months prior to data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior to data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consulted but opinion not taken into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
### MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

**% of households with multi-sectoral needs:** 84%

**% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:**
- Extreme (severity score 4): 13%
- Severe (severity score 3): 71%
- Stress (severity score 2): 2%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified 14%

**% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:**
- Shelter & non-food items: 73%
- WASH: 59%
- Food security & livelihoods: 52%
- Education: 48%
- Protection: 21%
- Health: 9%
- Nutrition: 5%

### PRIORITY NEEDS

**% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):**
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 69%
- Access to food: 63%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 44%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 39%
- Household/cooking items: 29%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 18%
- Clothing: 10%

**Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:**
1. Access to food: 1.81
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.58
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.64
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.60
5. Household/cooking items: 0.40
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.32
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.15

### POPULATION PROFILE

**Gender of head of household:**
- Female (50%): 13%
- Male (50%): 87%

**% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:**
- Before October 2016: 1%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 4%
- After 24 August 2017: 95%

**Total number of household interviews:** 101

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 50). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 71%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

75% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 68%
- Limited ventilation: 23%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 22%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 91%
- Materials don’t insulate: 18%
- Materials trap heat: 17%

32% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 64%
- No money to pay for materials: 26%
- No money to pay for labour: 8%
- Materials are unavailable: 2%
- No need to improve: 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...:

- 80% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 61% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 Households could select multiple options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 50). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

### RENT PAYMENT

of households reported having had to **pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter** in the 6 months prior to data collection

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 90%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 72%
- Shoes: 71%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 48%
- Blankets: 35%
- Kitchen sets: 35%
- Mosquito nets: 23%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 16%

### COOKING FUEL

of households reported having **received LPG refills** from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection

of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills **always lasted until the next distribution**

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 5):

- Bought firewood: 85%
- Collected firewood: 12%
- Bought LPG refills: 8%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 4%
- Charcoal or similar: 1%

of households reported an **expenditure on fuel** in the 30 days prior to data collection

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly **having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 20%
- To access or pay for household items: 12%
- To repair or build shelter: 9%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 50%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 46% Severe (severity score 3)
- 49% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 1% Not classified

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 5% Poor
- 28% Borderline
- 67% Acceptable

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 32%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/ fruits: 7%
- Long queues at distribution points: 2%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 1%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 1%
- Persons with disabilities face challenges accessing/at distribution sites: 1%

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 1%
- > 0 - 500: 1%
- > 500 - 1000: 5%
- > 1000 - 2000: 24%
- > 2000 - 5000: 54%
- > 5000: 15%

% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection: 99%

LIVELIHOODS

- 67% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

1 The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.
2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)

- Including imputed amount of assistance
  - Below SMEB: 63%
  - Between SMEB and MEB: 16%
  - Above MEB: 23%

- Excluding imputed amount of assistance
  - Below SMEB: 14%
  - Between SMEB and MEB: 84%

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection

- To access or pay for food: 93%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 20%
- To access or pay for education: 13%
- To access or pay for household items: 12%
- To repair or build shelter: 9%
- To access or pay for hygiene items: 3%

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies

- Stress coping strategies: 62%
- Crisis coping strategies: 26%
- Emergency coping strategies: 0%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g., blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; reducing working hours in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: 56%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 53% Severe (severity score 3)
- 7% Stress (severity score 2)
- 37% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 97% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 54% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

- 23% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose
  - Cooking: 13%
  - Drinking: 15%
  - Personal hygiene at bathing location: 18%
  - Other domestic purposes: 20%
  - Personal hygiene at shelter: 20%

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

- 20% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)
  - None: 46%
  - > 0 - 500: 50%
  - > 500 - 1000: 4%

**WATER SOURCE**

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 63%
- Shallow tubewell: 22%
- Deep tubewell: 12%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 3%

Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 101; households with males, n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 53%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 29%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 17%
- **VIP toilet**: 1%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females

1. **Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding**: 30%
2. **Latrines are unclean/unhygienic**: 16%
3. **Latrines are too far**: 11%
4. **Lack of light inside latrines**: 5%
5. **Older persons have problems accessing/using latrines**: 4%

#### Males

1. **Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding**: 26%
2. **Latrines are unclean/unhygienic**: 16%
3. **Latrines are too far**: 11%
4. **Lack of light inside latrines**: 5%
5. **Older persons have problems accessing/using latrines**: 4%

#### Top 4 reported problems

- **Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded**: 8%
- **Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic**: 8%
- **Bathing facilities are too far**: 1%
- **Shared bathing facility is available but females prefer not to use it**: 1%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

1. **1 bin at household level**: 76%
2. **> 1 bin at household level**: 13%
3. **Access to communal bin/pit**: 16%
4. **None**: 3%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

1. **Bin at household level (segmented)**: 61%
2. **Bin at household level (not segregated)**: 32%
3. **Throws waste in the open**: 4%
4. **Communal bin/pit (segmented)**: 12%
5. **Communal bin/pit (not segregated)**: 3%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 101; households with males, n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 45%

% of households per education LSG severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 4%
- Severe (severity score 3): 41%
- Stress (severity score 2): 30%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 19%
- Not classified: 7%

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT
of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 49%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 28%

HOME-BASED LEARNING
of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 54%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 31%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons
- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- Marriage and/or pregnancy
- No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
- Lack of light in shelter
- Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning

Girls
- 15%
- 15%
- 8%
- 6%
- 5%

Boys
- 9%
- 4%
- 4%
- 3%
- 3%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 80 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 76 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

% of households with at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open¹ 48%

% of households with at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back² 26%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)³

Girls

- Marriage and/or pregnancy (35%)
- Children are too old now (25%)
- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (19%)
- Children are too young still (10%)
- Household does not consider education important (6%)

Boys

- Children are too old now (29%) 
- Children have fallen too far behind on learning or lost learning (24%)
- Marriage (15%)
- Children are too young still (12%)
- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (9%)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back⁴

Girls

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (6%) 
2. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (4%) 
3. Lack of qualified teaching staff (4%)
4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (4%)
5. Marriage (2%)

Boys

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (5%) 
2. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (3%)
3. Lack of qualified teaching staff (3%)
4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (2%)
5. Marriage (2%)

COPING

13% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education⁶

EXPENDITURES

20% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
² The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
³ The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
⁴ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁵ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 47 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁶ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 18%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme
- 13% Severe
- 4% Stress
- 71% None or minimal
- 7% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

23% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Education: 17%
- Safe areas for playing: 13%
- Psychosocial support: 4%
- Food: 3%
- Health care: 3%
- Shelter: 2%
- Alternative care: 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Women/girls: 12%
- Men/boys: 2%

Top 5 reported areas:

- Markets: 6% (Women/girls), 2% (Men/boys)
- In transportation: 5% (Women/girls), 1% (Men/boys)
- Social/community areas: 4% (Women/girls), 1% (Men/boys)
- On their way to different facilities: 4% (Women/girls), 1% (Men/boys)
- In own shelter (at home): 3% (Women/girls), 1% (Men/boys)
- On their way to different facilities: 1% (Women/girls), 5% (Men/boys)

1% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not **send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse**, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>% Would Send</th>
<th>% Would Not Send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CICs)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Households could select multiple options.*

#### PROTECTION NEEDS

37% of households reported **needing protection services or support**

- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 16%
- Improved safety and security in general: 16%
- Access to justice and mediation: 13%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 10%

#### PROTECTION NEEDS

- **Improved safety and security**
  - For women and girls: 16%
  - In general: 16%
- **Access to justice and mediation**: 13%
- **Mental health & psychosocial support**: 10%

Overall, **43% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact**, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.
**NUTRITION**

**% of households with a nutrition LSG:**

| % of households per nutrition LSG severity score: | 0% Extreme (severity score 4) | 4% Severe (severity score 3) | 1% Stress (severity score 2) | 95% None or minimal (severity score 1) | 0% Not classified |

**CHILD NUTRITION**

- **2%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)
- **7%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- **54%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**MESSAGING**

- **96%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**OVERALL REACH**

- **98%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**

- **93%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**

- **25%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 56). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 96).
% of households with a health LSG: 8%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Severe (severity score 3): 8%
- Stress (severity score 2): 29%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 62%
- Not classified: 1%

WELLBEING

51% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

88% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic: 72%
- Private clinic: 25%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 18%
- Government clinic: 11%
- Traditional/ community healer: 6%

BARRIERS

28% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded: 21%
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 12%
  - Did not receive correct medications: 7%
  - No functional health facility nearby: 3%
  - Poor quality consultations at health facility: 3%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 85%
- 20 - 30 min: 13%
- > 30 min: 2%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (100%) to the health facility.

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 97). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

35% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

65% None
31% > 0 - 500
4% > 500 - 1000

COPING

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care

30%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- **23%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- **19%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- **23%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

**Most commonly reported challenges**

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 20%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 4%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 3%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 3%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 3%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 2%

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 11%
- Latrines (males): 8%
- Health care: 4%
- Bathing facilities (males): 1%
- Bathing facilities (females): 1%
- Food assistance: 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 101). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 92). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines [females] = 101; n, latrines [males] = 100; n, bathing facilities [females] = 101; n, bathing facilities [males] = 100; n, learning facilities [girls] = 44 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, learning facilities [boys] = 29 - results are representative with a +/- 19% margin of error.; n, health care = 100; n, food assistance = 101). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES**

**ACCESSING INFORMATION**

74% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Non-food items: 61%
- Site management/development: 32%
- Livelihoods: 31%
- Shelter: 24%
- Remote education: 21%
- Protection services: 10%
- Water: 9%
- Sanitation: 7%
- Nutrition services: 7%
- Health services: 5%
- Food assistance: 1%

4% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection. Top reported problem:

Aid workers do not share/disclose 1%

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

78% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 78%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 7%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 4%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 1%
- Not consulted: 10%

1% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection. Top reported challenge:

Language barriers 1%
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 85%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 12%
- Severe (severity score 3): 73%
- Stress (severity score 2): 2%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 13%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 71%
- WASH: 52%
- Education: 49%
- Food security & livelihoods: 49%
- Protection: 18%
- Health: 8%
- Nutrition: 7%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrades: 74%
- Access to food: 66%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 37%
- Household/cooking items: 33%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 25%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 19%
- Access to clean drinking water: 10%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.88
2. Shelter materials/upgrades: 1.64
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.60
4. Household/cooking items: 0.47
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.38
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.32
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.17

POPULATION PROFILE

- Female (50%): 13%
- Male (50%): 87%
- Age 0-4: 9%
- Age 5-11: 7%
- Age 12-17: 7%
- Age 18-24: 6%
- Age 25-59: 16%
- Age 60+: 2%

- Before October 2016: 1%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 2%
- After 24 August 2017: 97%

Average household size: 5.3 persons

Total number of household interviews: 112

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 50). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

70% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues
- Leaks during rain 64%
- Limited ventilation 17%
- Lack of insulation from cold 13%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 10%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues
- Damage to roof 92%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 13%
- Damage to walls 8%

39% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 4) among households not having made improvements/repairs
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 63%
- No money to pay for materials 44%
- No money to pay for labour 3%
- No need to improve 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...
- ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation 48%
- ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves 76%
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

### RENT PAYMENT

5% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI.

### COOKING FUEL

98% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

45% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):

- Bought firewood: 63%
- Bought LPG refills: 24%
- Collected firewood: 13%

56% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 5%
- To access or pay for household items: 1%

1. Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 7% Poor
- 20% Borderline
- 73% Acceptable

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 9% Extreme
- 38% Severe
- 53% No/minimal / stress
- 1% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 7% Poor
- 20% Borderline
- 73% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 1% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000
- 21% > 1000 - 2000
- 65% > 2000 - 5000
- 11% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

37% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:
- Food items do not last until next distribution
- Items received through distributions are of low quality
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
- Long queues at distribution points
- Items received through distributions are less preferred
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter

33% Food items do not last until next distribution
11% Items received through distributions are of low quality
6% Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
6% Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
2% Long queues at distribution points
1% Items received through distributions are less preferred
1% Cannot carry assistance to shelter

LIVELIHOODS

71% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

1 The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.
2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)

- Below SMEB: 0% - 61%
- Between SMEB and MEB: 20% - 27%
- Above MEB: 80% - 12%

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection

- To access or pay for food: 98%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To access or pay for education: 6%
- To repair or build shelter: 5%
- To pay for ceremonies: 1%
- To access or pay for household items: 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Exhusted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection

- Stress coping strategies: 73%
- Crisis coping strategies: 12%
- Emergency coping strategies: 3%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and gifts, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g., blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.
4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.
5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.
6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 54%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 53% Severe (severity score 3)
- 4% Stress (severity score 2)
- 41% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 97% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- 38% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER SOURCE

- % of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)
  - Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site 54%
  - Deep tubewell 20%
  - Shallow tubewell 20%
  - Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown) 7%

WATER QUANTITIES

- % of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection
  - 13%
- % of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose
  - Cooking 7%
  - Drinking 7%
  - Personal hygiene at bathing location 11%
  - Other domestic purposes 12%
  - Personal hygiene at shelter 12%

COPING

- % of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water
  - 24%
- Top 5 reported strategies
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one 19%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking 10%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking 4%
  - Reduce drinking water consumption 4%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water 1%

Footnote: Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

**SANITATION FACILITIES**

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 63%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 21%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 13%
- VIP toilet: 3%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 26%</td>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 13%</td>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far: 11%</td>
<td>Latrines are too far: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light inside latrines: 8%</td>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach: 7%</td>
<td>Lack of light inside latrines: 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BATHING FACILITIES**

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 5%</td>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far: 4%</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 2%</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 2%</td>
<td>Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASTE MANAGEMENT**

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

| 1 bin at household level: 59% |
| > 1 bin at household level: 19% |
| Access to communal bin/pit: 24% |
| None: 3% |

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

| Bin at household level (segmented): 58% |
| Bin at household level (not segregated): 21% |
| Throws waste in the open: 5% |
| Communal bin/pit (segmented): 17% |
| Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 6% |

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 112; households with males, n = 111). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
**EDUCATION**

**% of households with a education LSG:** 46%

**% of households per education LSG severity score:**

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 43% Severe (severity score 3)
- 32% Stress (severity score 2)
- 19% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 4% Not classified

---

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

- 48% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled in learning facilities** before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- 46% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled²

- 29% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled³

---

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

- 59% of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- 54% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning²

- 42% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning³

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 92 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 86 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

- 48% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)
- 46% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)
- 29% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)
- 29% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\)
  - Girls:
    - 34% Marriage and/or pregnancy
    - 25% Children are too old now
    - 16% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 11% Children are too young still
    - 6% Household does not consider education important
  - Boys:
    - 34% Children are too old now
    - 25% Marriage
    - 16% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 11% Children are too young still
    - 6% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^5\)
- Girls:
  - 12% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
  - 7% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children
  - 7% Children are too old now
  - 4% Children have fallen too far behind on learning
  - 4% Lack of qualified teaching staff
- Boys:
  - 11% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
  - 3% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children
  - 3% Children have fallen too far behind on learning
  - 3% Lack of qualified teaching staff
  - 2% No appropriate learning content provided for older children

COPING

- 6% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^6\)

EXPENDITURES

- 21% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 48 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
\(^6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 16%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 13% Severe (severity score 3)
- 8% Stress (severity score 2)
- 67% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 9% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

23% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- Education 17%
- Safe areas for playing 8%
- Food 6%
- Health care 3%
- Psychosocial support 2%
- Shelter 1%
- Alternative care 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Top 5 reported areas

- Women/girls
  - Markets 4%
  - Social/community areas 4%
  - Distribution sites 3%
  - On their way to different facilities 3%
  - In own shelter (at home) 3%

- Men/boys
  - Markets 4%
  - Social/community areas 3%
  - In own shelter (at home) 3%
  - On their way to different facilities 1%

3% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

1 Households could select multiple options.
### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CICs)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 46% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

### PROTECTION NEEDS

% of households reporting type of support needed

- Improved safety and security in general: 40%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 21%
- Access to justice and mediation: 17%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 4%

Overall, 47% of households reported needing protection services or support.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 9%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:
- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 9% Severe (severity score 3)
- 3% Stress (severity score 2)
- 88% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION
- 11% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)
- 16% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- 52% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

MESSAGING
- 89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

OVERALL REACH
- 94% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING
- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- 86% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

ADOLESCENT GIRLS
- 13% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 108).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: **8%**

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- **8%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **42%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **50%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **0%** Not classified

**WELLBEING**

- **55%** of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- Households could select up to 3 options.
- See Annex 1 for details on methodology.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

- **90%** of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

**BARRIERS**

- **36%** of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: **18%**
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: **15%**
  - Did not receive correct medications: **13%**
  - Health services are too far away/lack of transport: **5%**
  - Poor quality consultations at health facility: **4%**

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 0 - < 20 min: **65%**
  - 20 - 30 min: **27%**
  - > 30 min: **8%**

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (95%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (5%).

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 126). Households could select multiple options.
2. Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

### EXPENDITURES

39% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

![Bar chart showing percentage of households reporting total monthly expenditure by range (BDT)]

- 61% of households reported none
- 38% of households reported between 0 - 500
- 0% of households reported between 500 - 1000
- 0% of households reported between 1000 - 2000
- 1% of households reported > 2000 - 5000

### COPING

30% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 104). Households could select up to 5 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 112; n, latrines (males) = 111; n, bathing facilities (females) = 112; n, bathing facilities (males) = 111; n, learning facilities (girls) = 55 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 111; n, food assistance = 112). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 104). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 112; n, latrines (males) = 111; n, bathing facilities (females) = 112; n, bathing facilities (males) = 111; n, learning facilities (girls) = 55 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 111; n, food assistance = 112). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

76% of households reported **not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- **Non-food items**: 53%
- **Livelihoods**: 38%
- **Site management/development**: 30%
- **Shelter**: 21%
- **Remote education**: 18%
- **Protection services**: 12%
- **Nutrition services**: 11%
- **Health services**: 7%
- **Water**: 5%
- **Sanitation**: 4%
- **Food assistance**: 3%

- 11% of households reported having **faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- **Top 5 reported problems**
  - Information isn’t shared often enough: 4%
  - Aid workers do not share/disclose: 3%
  - No door to door information sharing: 3%
  - Messages are not clear/understandable: 2%
  - The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 2%

- 97% of households reported having been **able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 100% of households reported having been **able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- **83%** of households reported having **been consulted** and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

  - **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid**: 83%
  - **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality**: 11%
  - **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both**: 2%
  - **Consulted but opinion not taken into account**: 3%
  - **Not consulted**: 2%

- 0% of households reported having **faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints** on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 94%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 16%
- Severe (severity score 3): 79%
- Stress (severity score 2): 3%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 1%
- Not classified: 2%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Food security & livelihoods: 63%
- WASH: 59%
- Shelter & non-food items: 58%
- Education: 53%
- Protection: 32%
- Health: 12%
- Nutrition: 7%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Access to food: 68%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 60%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 37%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 26%
- Household/cooking items: 25%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 22%
- Access to clean drinking water: 12%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.80
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.34
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.63
4. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.53
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.41
6. Household/cooking items: 0.39
7. Access to education: 0.21

Average household size: 5.5 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 16%
- Male: 84%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 22%
- Male: 78%

Total number of household interviews: 107
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 55%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

62% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 50%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 18%
- Limited ventilation: 11%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 79%
- Materials don’t insulate: 12%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 9%

22% of households reported not having made improvements or repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

35% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 55% Severe (severity score 3)
- 23% Stress (severity score 2)
- 21% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

57% of households reported having made improvements or repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 39%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 24%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 17%
- Repaired the walls: 7%
- Built a new shelter: 7%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 50%
- No money to pay for materials: 26%
- Good quality materials are too expensive: 2%
- Materials are unavailable: 2%
- No need to improve: 48%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 77% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 62% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

RENT PAYMENT

5% of households reported having to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

- % of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:
  - Fans: 93%
  - Shoes: 65%
  - Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 64%
  - Clothing and winter clothing: 58%
  - Blankets: 53%
  - Kitchen sets: 53%
  - Mosquito nets: 47%
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 46%

53% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

COOKING FUEL

100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

43% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

- % of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):
  - Bought firewood: 74%
  - Bought LPG refills: 21%
  - Collected firewood: 8%

57% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 12%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%
- To access or pay for household items: 3%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 107).
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 61%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

9% Extreme
51% Severe
39% No/minimal / stress
0% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

8% Poor
33% Borderline
59% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

96% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 4%
- > 0 - 500: 2%
- > 500 - 1000: 7%
- > 1000 - 2000: 13%
- > 2000 - 5000: 54%
- > 5000: 21%

FOOD ASSISTANCE

62% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges:

Food items do not last until next distribution: 58%
Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 12%
Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 7%
Long queues at distribution points: 7%
Items received through distributions are less preferred: 6%
Items received through distributions are of low quality: 4%
Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 1%

LIVELIHOODS

69% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)\(^1\)

- 66% Below SMEB
- 19% Between SMEB and MEB
- 15% Above MEB

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^2\)

- To access or pay for food 96%
- To access or pay for healthcare 35%
- To access or pay for education 12%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes 12%
- To repair or build shelter 3%
- To access or pay for household items 3%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel 1%

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^3\)

- 66% of households by coping strategy
  - Borrowing money to buy food
  - Buying food on credit
  - Spending savings
  - Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations
  - Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance
  - Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money
  - Reducing essential non-food expenditures
  - Selling jewelry/gold
  - Selling household goods
  - Selling labour in advance
  - Selling productive assets or means of transport
  - Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions
  - Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions
  - Entire household migrated
  - Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs
  - Child marriage
  - Begging

- 30% of households by coping strategy
  - Adopted coping strategy
  - Coping strategy not available to household
  - Exhausted coping strategy
  - No need to adopt coping strategy

\(^1\) In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

\(^3\) Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

\(^4\) Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

\(^5\) Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

\(^6\) Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 57%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%
- Severe (severity score 3): 54%
- Stress (severity score 2): 18%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 25%
- Not classified: 0%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 100% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 47% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

- 36% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 100% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.

WATER SOURCE

- 60% of households reported the main source of water used for drinking to be piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site.
- 23% of households reported using a deep tubewell.
- 14% of households reported using a shallow tubewell.
- 3% of households reported using deep or shallow tubewell (unknown).

COPING

- 23% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water.

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 17%
2. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 6%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 5%
4. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 2%
5. Buy drinking water from vendors: 1%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush or pour/flush toilet</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with a slab and platform</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without a slab or platform</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP toilet</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket toilet and put in latrine after</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Lack of light inside latrines</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Latrines are not functioning</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities have problems accessing/using bathing facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Method</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bin at household level</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 bin at household level</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Method</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (segmented)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (not segmented)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throws waste in the open</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (segmented)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (not segmented)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of households with a education LSG: 50%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Girls
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 49%

Boys
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 35%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

Girls
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 58%

Boys
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 41%

Top 5 reported challenges/ reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Reason</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children too old to participate</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/-12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/-14% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/-14% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 92 - results are representative with a +/-11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/-11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
SENDING BACK

- 55% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.\(^1\)
- 53% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.\(^2\)
- 30% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.\(^3\)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\):

- **Girls**
  1. Marriage and/or pregnancy (42%)
  2. Children are too old now (38%)
  3. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (15%)
  4. Children are too young still (11%)
  5. Children needed to help at home (8%)

- **Boys**
  1. Children are too old now (39%)
  2. Marriage (30%)
  3. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (16%)
  4. Children are too young still (12%)
  5. Children working outside the home (7%)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back.\(^5\):

- **Girls**
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (10%)
  2. Children are too old now (10%)
  3. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (4%)
  4. Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility (4%)
  5. Learning facilities overcrowded (4%)

- **Boys**
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (11%)
  2. Lack of Rohingya teaching staff (5%)
  3. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (3%)
  4. No appropriate learning content provided for younger children (3%)
  5. Learning facilities overcrowded (3%)

COPING

- 12% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.\(^6\)

EXPENDITURES

- 24% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.
% of households with a protection LSG: **30%**

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 6% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 24% Severe (severity score 3)
- 11% Stress (severity score 2)
- 59% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

- **24%** of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection case management/social work support</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 6)

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

- **11%** of households reported areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 5 reported areas**

- **10%** of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Send (% of households)</th>
<th>Not Send (% of households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 38% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.

### PROTECTION NEEDS

% of households reporting type of support needed

- **Improved safety and security in general**: 49%
- **Improved safety and security for women and girls**: 15%
- **Mental health & psychosocial support**: 6%
- **Access to justice and mediation**: 3%

54% of households reported needing protection services or support.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 7%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:
- 0% Extreme
- 7% Severe
- 4% Stress
- 87% None or minimal
- 2% Not classified

**CHILD NUTRITION**
- 3% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 14% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 49% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

**MESSAGING**
- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**OVERALL REACH**
- 98% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**
- 83% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**
- 76% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

- 23% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13.3% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 102).
% of households with a health LSG: 12%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- Severe (severity score 3): 12%
- Stress (severity score 2): 44%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 44%
- Not classified: 0%

WELLBEING

- 66% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

- 88% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- 62% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection reported treatment at an NGO clinic.
- 38% reported treatment at a private clinic.
- 28% reported treatment at a pharmacy or drug shop in the market.
- 4% reported treatment at a government clinic.
- 1% reported treatment at a traditional/community healer.

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

- 57% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation.
- Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (95%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (5%).

BARRIERS

- 57% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 32%
  - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 30%
  - Did not receive correct medications: 15%
  - No functional health facility nearby: 11%
  - Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 6%

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 152). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

45% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 55%
- 40%
- 4%
- 0%
- 0%
- 1%

- None
- > 0 - 500
- > 500 - 1000
- > 1000 - 2000
- > 2000 - 5000
- > 5000

**COPING**

35% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- Of households with adult women, 21% reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- Of households with adult men, 25% reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps. Households could select up to 5 options.
- Of households with children, 23% reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps. Households could select up to 5 options.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 12% of households reported this challenge.
- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 12% of households reported this challenge.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 7% of households reported this challenge.
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 6% of households reported this challenge.
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1% of households reported this challenge.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 1% of households reported this challenge.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 1% of households reported this challenge.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 93% of households reported feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 16% of households reported that health care was too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.
- 11% of households reported that bathing facilities (females) were too far.
- 10% of households reported that latrines (males) were too far.
- 9% of households reported that latrines (females) were too far.
- 7% of households reported that food assistance was too far.
- 7% of households reported that bathing facilities (males) were too far.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 107; n, latrines (males) = 104; n, bathing facilities (females) = 107; n, bathing facilities (males) = 104; n, learning facilities (girls) = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, health care = 107; n, food assistance = 107). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
Households were asked separately about each type of service.

Households could select up to 3 options.

Households could select up to 5 options.

**ACCESSING INFORMATION**

79% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

7% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 4 reported problems:
  - Don’t know where to get information/ who to ask: 5%
  - No door to door information sharing: 2%
  - Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%
  - No female staff providing information: 1%

- 79% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:
  - Non-food items: 61%
  - Site management/development: 54%
  - Livelihoods: 43%
  - Shelter: 32%
  - Protection services: 29%
  - Remote education: 28%
  - Health services: 21%
  - Nutrition services: 19%
  - Water: 15%
  - Sanitation: 5%
  - Food assistance: 3%

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

80% of households reported having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

4% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 2 reported challenges:
  - Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 3%
  - Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 1%
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 86%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 13%
- Severe (severity score 3): 73%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 14%
- Not classified: 0%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Food security & livelihoods: 82%
- Shelter & non-food items: 70%
- WASH: 62%
- Education: 42%
- Protection: 35%
- Nutrition: 19%
- Health: 7%

### Priority Needs

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Access to food: 62%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 57%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 33%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 33%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 25%
- Household/cooking items: 22%
- Access to education: 20%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.61
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.37
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.60
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.58
5. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.45
6. Access to education: 0.35
7. Household/cooking items: 0.28

### Population Profile

- Gender of head of household:
  - Female: 15%
  - Male: 85%

- Gender of respondent:
  - Female: 18%
  - Male: 82%

- Average household size: 5.5 persons

- % of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
  - Before October 2016: 0%
  - October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 5%
  - After 24 August 2017: 95%

- Total number of household interviews: 116

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 100).
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 72%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

75% of households reported at least one shelter issue¹

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain 66%
- Limited ventilation 18%
- Lack of insulation from cold 18%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 9%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 6%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues²,³
- Damage to roof 86%
- Damage to walls 26%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 13%

39% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

29% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs³:
- Replaced tarpaulin 30%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 22%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 16%
- Installed bracing 5%
- Built a new shelter 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs⁴
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 62%
- No money to pay for materials 45%
- Materials are unavailable 5%
- No money to pay for labour 5%
- No need to improve 33%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...³,⁵
- ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation 82%
- ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves 64%

¹ Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
² The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
³ Households could select multiple options.
⁴ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
⁵ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 50). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

See Annex 1 for details on methodology.
# SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

## Rent Payment

4% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

## Cooking Fuel

99% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

57% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

- Bought firewood: 69%
- Collected firewood: 27%
- Bought LPG refills: 20%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 6%

## Non-Food Items

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 92%
- Shoes: 66%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 58%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 50%
- Blankets: 42%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 40%
- Mosquito nets: 39%
- Kitchen sets: 36%

## Coping

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 15%
- To pay electricity bill/for solar batteries: 1%
- To repair or build shelter: 1%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

---

1. Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 115).

4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 7% Poor
- 48% Borderline
- 45% Acceptable

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 8% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 70% Severe (severity score 3)
- 22% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 1% Not classified

% of households with a food security LSG: 78%

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 7% Poor
- 48% Borderline
- 45% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 1% > 0 - 500
- 11% > 500 - 1000
- 19% > 1000 - 2000
- 47% > 2000 - 5000
- 22% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

49% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:
- Food items do not last until next distribution (43%)
- Long queues at distribution points (8%)
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (4%)
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport (4%)
- Items received through distributions are less preferred (3%)
- Items received through distributions are of low quality (3%)
- Lack of clarity on food entitlements (3%)

LIVELIHOODS

77% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket). The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending). Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

- 61% of households were below the SMEB
- 27% were between SMEB and MEB
- 13% were above the MEB

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection. Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and gifts, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food or money; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

69% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- Borrowing money to buy food: 50%
- Buying food on credit: 48%
- Spending savings: 47%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 47%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 35%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money: 29%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 27%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 26%
- Selling household goods: 25%
- Selling labour in advance: 16%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 15%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 11%
- Child marriage: 10%
- Entire household migrated: 8%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 2%
-To access or pay for clothing, shoes: 84%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 26%
- To access or pay for education: 15%
- To access or pay for agricultural inputs: 10%
- To access or pay for electricity bill/solar batteries: 1%
- To repair or build shelter: 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

- Emergency coping strategies: 0%
- Crisis coping strategies: 16%
- Stress coping strategies: 64%
- Adopted coping strategies: 84%

... 65% of households reported having exhausted or adopted...
% of households with a WASH LSG: 60%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 1%
- Severe (severity score 4): 59%
- Stress (severity score 3): 11%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 28%
- Not classified: 1%

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 92% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 47% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

**WATER SOURCE**

- 59% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 23% Deep tubewell
- 15% Shallow tubewell
- 3% Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

**WATER QUANTITIES**

- 43% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

- 51% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one 43%
2. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water 13%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking 9%
4. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking 9%
5. Reduce drinking water consumption 1%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 63%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 16%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 16%
- VIP toilet: 3%
- Bucket toilet and put in latrine after: 2%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females

- Bathing facilities are too far: 19%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 16%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 3%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 2%

#### Males

- Bathing facilities are too far: 16%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 7%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 3%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 2%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 58%
- > 1 bin at household level: 29%
- Access to communal bin/pit (segregated): 16%
- Access to communal bin/pit (not segregated): 16%
- None: 4%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 52%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 30%
- Throws waste in the open: 17%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 7%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 7%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 116; households with males, n = 114). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 39%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 35% Severe (severity score 3)
- 36% Stress (severity score 2)
- 20% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 5% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

- 44% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- 42% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.

- 31% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

- 50% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- 50% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

- 33% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefiting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- 53% Girls
- 45% Boys

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
<td>Lack of quality learning materials at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance from learning facilitators</td>
<td>Lack of light in shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light in shelter</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 95 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error; households with boys, n = 91 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

46% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

51% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

28% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):

**Girls**
- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 32%
- Marriage and/or pregnancy: 29%
- Children are too old now: 20%
- Household does not consider education important: 15%
- Children are too young still: 12%

**Boys**
- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 30%
- Children are too old now: 29%
- Marriage and/or pregnancy: 20%
- Household does not consider education important: 15%
- Children are too young still: 12%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:

**Girls**
- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 15%
- Learning facilities overcrowded: 10%
- Lack of qualified teaching staff: 8%
- Children have fallen too far behind on learning: 5%
- Poor learning facility infrastructure: 5%

**Boys**
- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility: 22%
- Learning facilities overcrowded: 14%
- Lack of qualified teaching staff: 14%
- Children have fallen too far behind on learning: 7%
- Lack of quality learning materials: 7%

COPING

10% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

31% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 66 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 41 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 73 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
PROTECTION

% of households with a protection LSG: 31%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%
- Severe (severity score 3): 28%
- Stress (severity score 2): 10%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 49%
- Not classified: 9%

Limitations
- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

33% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)
- Education: 18%
- Safe areas for playing: 16%
- Food: 9%
- Health care: 6%
- Alternative care: 5%
- Safety and security: 3%
- Shelter: 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Top 5 reported areas

Women/girls
- On their way to different facilities: 9%
- Markets: 5%
- Distribution sites: 5%
- In transportation: 4%
- Latrines or bathing facilities: 3%

Men/boys
- On their way to different facilities: 9%
- Markets: 8%
- In transportation: 7%
- Social/community areas: 5%
- On the way to collect firewood: 4%

16% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
## PROTECTION

### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS-OF-CONTACT</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/prefer not to answer</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, **42% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.**

---

### PROTECTION NEEDS

- **58%** of households reported needing protection services or support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Needs</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Households could select multiple options.*
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 18%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme
- 17% Severe
- 6% Stress
- 75% None or minimal
- 1% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 12% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (1 April 2021)

- 26% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 38% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 87% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 96% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 73% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 57% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 23% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 113).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:**

- 8%

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- Severe: 8%
- Stress: 45%
- None or minimal: 45%
- Not classified: 3%

---

**WELLBEING**

56% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

90% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 83%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 25%
- Private clinic: 18%
- Government clinic: 1%

---

**BARRIERS**

40% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 23%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 19%
- Did not receive correct medications: 9%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 5%
- No functional health facility nearby: 3%

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 60%
- 20 - 30 min: 33%
- > 30 min: 7%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (98%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (2%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 144). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

35% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 65% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
  - None
  - > 0 - 500
  - > 500 - 1000

**COPING**

26% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
## Site Management

### Mobility Around Camps

- **44%** of households with adult women reported that **adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.

- **44%** of households with adult men reported that **adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

- **40%** of households with children reported that **children in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

### Challenges

#### Most commonly reported challenges

- **Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery**: 29% (30%, 33%)
- **Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep**: 17% (16%, 21%)
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night**: 12% (13%, 6%)
- **Older persons face difficulties moving around camps**: 7% (3%, NA)
- **Distances have become longer due to fencing**: 5% (6%, 2%)
- **Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around**: 4% (3%, 4%)
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment**: 2% (1%, 1%)

### Community Representation

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- **92%** Yes
- **6%** No
- **2%** Don’t know / prefer not to answer

### Accessing Services

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (females)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (females)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (males)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (females)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (females)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (males)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning facilities (girls)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning facilities (boys)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 113). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 109). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 116; n, latrines (males) = 114; n, bathing facilities (females) = 116; n, bathing facilities (males) = 114; n, learning facilities (girls) = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 37 - results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.; n, health care = 114; n, food assistance = 115). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES**

### ACCESSING INFORMATION

74% of households reported **not having been able to access (receive and understand)** enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Non-food items: 58%
- Livelihoods: 51%
- Shelter: 39%
- Site management/development: 39%
- Remote education: 38%
- Protection services: 32%
- Water: 25%
- Health services: 21%
- Sanitation: 14%
- Nutrition services: 13%
- Food assistance: 6%

14% of households reported having **faced problems** when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Don’t know where to get information/ who to ask: 7%
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 6%
- Information isn’t shared often enough: 3%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 2%
- Older persons face difficulties receiving/ understanding information: 2%

### COMMUNICATION ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting **having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account** related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

68% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
- 8% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
- 10% Not consulted

6% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both

8% Consulted but opinion not taken into account

12% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 9%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 4%
- The process was too complicated: 3%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 2%
- Language barriers: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 90%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 19%
- Severe (severity score 3): 71%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 9%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 69%
- Food security & livelihoods: 65%
- WASH: 65%
- Education: 60%
- Protection: 36%
- Nutrition: 10%
- Health: 9%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Access to food: 68%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 53%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 35%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 29%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 24%
- Household/cooking items: 24%
- Access to clean drinking water: 20%

Average household size: 5.3 persons

POPULATION PROFILE

Gender of head of household:

- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:

- Before October 2016: 2%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 8%
- After 24 August 2017: 90%

Gender of respondent:

- Female (23%)
- Male (77%)

Total number of household interviews: 104

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 64%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 63% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 20% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 4% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER/issues & IMPROVEMENTS

67% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 59%
- Limited ventilation 25%
- Lack of insulation from cold 15%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 12%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 86%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 19%
- Damage to walls 13%

27% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

30% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

55% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin 31%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 17%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 15%
- Built a new shelter 13%
- Installed bracing 11%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 57%
- No money to pay for materials 25%
- No money to pay for labour 7%
- Good quality materials are too expensive 2%
- No need to improve 34%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 83% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 41% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves
RENT PAYMENT

- 6% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

- 93% of households reported having insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:
  - Fans: 93%
  - Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 69%
  - Blankets: 60%
  - Shoes: 60%
  - Mosquito nets: 37%
  - Clothing and winter clothing: 35%
  - Kitchen sets: 34%
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 32%

- 58% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

COOKING FUEL

- 100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- 58% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.
- 50% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- 64% of households reported buying firewood.
- 30% of households reported buying LPG refills.
- 14% of households reported collecting firewood.
- 2% of households reported using charcoal or similar.

COPING

- 2% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:
  - To repair or build shelter: 6%
  - To access or pay for household items: 6%
  - To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 4%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 44). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
**FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS**

% of households with a food security LSG: **63%**

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/minimal/stress (1 or 2)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOOD CONSUMPTION**

% of households by Food Consumption Score

- 6% Poor
- 44% Borderline
- 50% Acceptable

**FOOD ASSISTANCE**

46% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 41%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 10%
- Long queues at distribution points: 10%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 9%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 7%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 5%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 2%

**FOOD EXPENDITURE**

99% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 1%
- > 0 - 500: 1%
- > 500 - 1000: 7%
- > 1000 - 2000: 17%
- > 2000 - 5000: 59%
- > 5000: 15%

**LIVELIHOODS**

74% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).

- 50% Below SMEB
- 19% Between SMEB and MEB
- 30% Above MEB
- 81% Excluding imputed amount of assistance
- 20% Including imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- To access or pay for food 91%
- To access or pay for healthcare 35%
- To access or pay for education 7%
- To repair or build shelter 6%
- To access or pay for household items 6%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes 4%
- To access or pay for hygiene items 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted... of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- Stress coping strategies1,4 65%
- Crisis coping strategies3,5 12%
- Emergency coping strategies3,6 0%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.
4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.
5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money; selling, exchanging and sharing food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance.
6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 64%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 62% Severe (severity score 3)
- 5% Stress (severity score 2)
- 28% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 3% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 90% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 61% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

- 31% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

- 36% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 29%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 8%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 4%
- Reduce drinking water consumption: 4%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 3%

WATER SOURCE

- 34% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 33% Deep tubewell
- 29% Shallow tubewell
- 5% Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)
- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 57%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 18%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 17%
- VIP toilet: 8%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

**Females**
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 43%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 20%
- Latrines are too far: 12%
- Latrines are not functioning: 7%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 6%

**Males**
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 38%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 26%
- Latrines are too far: 11%
- Latrines are not functioning: 7%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 6%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

**Females**
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 6%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 4%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 3%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 2%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 1%

**Males**
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 5%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 5%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 4%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 2%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 67%
- > 1 bin at household level: 12%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 28%
- None: 7%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 52%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 21%
- Throws waste in the open: 18%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 17%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 9%
% of households with a education LSG: 58%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSG

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 60%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 37%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 56%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 41%

of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.

Girls

- Marriage and/or pregnancy: 24%
- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 15%
- Children too old to participate: 10%
- Lack of quality learning materials at home: 5%
- No space for children to study in shelter: 5%

Boys

- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 24%
- Children too old to participate: 15%
- Lack of technological devices needed to access home-based learning: 10%
- Children too young to participate: 5%
- No space for children to study in shelter: 5%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error; households with boys, n = 78 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

**SENDING BACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back</th>
<th>% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

1. **Girls**
   - 63% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.
   - **Top 5 reported challenges**
     1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (15%)
     2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (5%)
     3. Learning facilities overcrowded (5%)
     4. Marriage and/or pregnancy (5%)
     5. Children working outside the home (2%)

2. **Boys**
   - **Top 5 reported challenges**
     1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (14%)
     2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (5%)
     3. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (2%)
     4. No appropriate learning content provided for younger children (2%)
     5. Children working outside the home (2%)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting</th>
<th>% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37% Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>39% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>15% Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% Children are too old now</td>
<td>5% Households do not consider education important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>5% Children are too young still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% Children needed to help at home</td>
<td>5% No appropriate learning content provided for older children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

7% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

**EXPENDITURES**

31% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 70 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 48 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 40 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**% of households with a protection LSG:** 35%

**% of households per protection LSG severity score:**

- 11% Extreme
- 24% Severe
- 7% Stress
- 53% None or minimal
- 6% Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

- 28% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

- 16% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

**Women/girls**

- 8% Markets
- 7% Distribution sites
- 7% On their way to different facilities
- 6% In transportation
- 5% Latrines or bathing facilities

**Men/boys**

- 11% Markets
- 7% On their way to different facilities
- 3% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 3% In transportation
- 1% Water points

- 12% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CICs)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 34% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

### PROTECTION NEEDS

55% of households reported needing protection services or support

- Improved safety and security in general: 42%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 15%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 7%
- Access to justice and mediation: 2%

Overall, 34% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 10%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

- 15% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 17% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 36% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 78% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 21% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 99).
HEALTH

% of households with a health LSG: 9%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Severe (severity score 3) 9%
- Stress (severity score 2) 38%
- None or minimal (severity score 1) 52%
- Not classified 1%

WELLBEING

55% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

BARRIERS

39% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

1. Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable 23%
2. Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded 19%
3. Did not receive correct medications 7%
4. No functional health facility nearby 4%
5. Health services are too far away/lack of transport 4%

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

91% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic 71%
- Private clinic 33%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market 13%
- Government clinic 6%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min 71%
- 20 - 30 min 27%
- > 30 min 2%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (91%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (9%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 104). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

50% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

COPING

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- Of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.  
- Of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- Of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

- % of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

- % of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 103; n, latrines (males) = 104; n, bathing facilities (females) = 103; n, bathing facilities (males) = 104; n, learning facilities (girls) = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 46 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 103; n, food assistance = 104). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

80% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Non-food items: 60%
- Livelihoods: 47%
- Site management/development: 41%
- Remote education: 33%
- Protection services: 29%
- Shelter: 26%
- Health services: 13%
- Sanitation: 12%
- Nutrition services: 12%
- Water: 11%
- Food assistance: 3%

17% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 7%
- The information shared is irrelevant/no new information is shared: 4%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 3%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 3%
- No door to door information sharing: 3%

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 63%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 12%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 6%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 13%
- Not consulted: 1%
- Don’t know/ prefer not to answer: 5%

7% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 3%
- The process was too complicated: 1%
- Language barriers: 1%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 81%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 18%
- Severe (severity score 3): 63%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 19%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; non-food items</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security &amp; livelihoods</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Shelter materials/upgrade: 61%
- Access to food: 55%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 38%
- Household/cooking items: 37%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 33%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 19%
- Access to clean drinking water: 15%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.46
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.45
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.61
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.57
5. Household/cooking items: 0.54
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.35
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.29

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

---

### Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

---

### SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

#### 69%

of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues

- Leaks during rain: 59%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 16%
- Limited ventilation: 14%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 6%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 1%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues

- Damage to roof: 80%
- Damage to walls: 20%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 7%

30% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

36% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 66%

#### LSG

- 0% Extreme
- 66% Severe
- 12% Stress
- 22% None or minimal
- 0% Not classified

#### 45%

of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs

- Replaced tarpaulin: 32%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 25%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 20%
- Repaired the walls: 12%
- Installed bracing: 7%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 53%
- No money to pay for materials: 28%
- No money to pay for labour: 9%
- Materials are unavailable: 2%
- No need to improve: 45%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 82% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 76% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
RENT PAYMENT

3% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 95%
- Shoes: 84%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 66%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 65%
- Blankets: 55%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 54%
- Mosquito nets: 49%
- Kitchen sets: 43%

55% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

COOKING FUEL

98% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

60% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 50%
- Bought LPG refills: 45%
- Collected firewood: 11%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

44% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 2%
- To access or pay for household items: 2%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 106).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 44). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 60%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 11% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 49% Severe (severity score 3)
- 38% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 2% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 6% Poor
- 41% Borderline
- 54% Acceptable

FOOD ASSISTANCE

- 34% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution (29%)
2. Long queues at distribution points (8%)
3. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport (6%)
4. Items received through distributions are less preferred (3%)
5. Items received through distributions are of low quality (2%)
6. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (2%)
7. Cannot carry assistance to shelter (2%)

FOOD EXPENDITURE

- 97% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 3% None
- 3% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000
- 2% > 1000 - 2000
- 11% > 2000 - 5000
- 60% > 5000

FOOD EXPENDITURE

- 34% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

- 3% None
- 3% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000
- 2% > 1000 - 2000
- 11% > 2000 - 5000
- 60% > 5000

LIVELIHOODS

- 69% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^2\)

- To access or pay for food: 77%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 27%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To access or pay for education: 5%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%
- To access or pay for agricultural inputs: 2%
- To pay ticket/cover travel for migration: 2%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^3\)

- Stress coping strategies\(^3, 4\): 57%
- Crisis coping strategies\(^3, 5\): 17%
- Emergency coping strategies\(^3, 6\): 0%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs for agriculture, fishing, business (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/ money.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 64%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4) 1%
- Severe (severity score 3) 63%
- Stress (severity score 2) 13%
- None or minimal (severity score 1) 20%
- Not classified 3%

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 92% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 53% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES
- 30% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose
  - Cooking: 10%
  - Drinking: 10%
  - Personal hygiene at bathing location: 19%
  - Personal hygiene at shelter: 23%
  - Other domestic purposes: 28%

COPING
- 45% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 39%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 6%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 4%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 3%
  - Buy drinking water from vendors: 2%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)
- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 56%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 28%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 15%
- Open hole: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 reported problems</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are not functioning</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienian</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 reported problems</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIN TYPE</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bin at household level</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 bin at household level</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTE DISPOSAL</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (segregated)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (not segregated)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throws waste in the open</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (segregated)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (not segregated)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 107; households with males, n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.
² Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: **51%**

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- **4%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **47%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **19%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **23%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **7%** Not classified

---

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

50% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled** in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- **53%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.
- **28%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

---

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

50% of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- **53%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
- **33%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

---

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards **benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning**.

- **53%** girls
- **46%** boys

**Top 5 reported challenges/reasons**

- **Girls**
  - **20%** Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - **20%** Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - **5%** Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - **5%** Children too old to participate
  - **4%** Household does not consider education important

- **Boys**
  - **13%** Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - **8%** Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - **8%** Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
  - **5%** Marriage
  - **5%** No home-based learning offered

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 43). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 81 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 84 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

- Girls: 49%
- Boys: 24%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back

- Girls: 60%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back

- Boys: 17%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

- Girls: 32%
- Boys: 16%

Top 5 reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>1. Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marriage</td>
<td>2. Learning facilities overcrowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children are too old now</td>
<td>3. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Children are too young still</td>
<td>4. Children working outside the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>5. Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

- Girls: 28%
- Boys: 17%

Top 5 reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>1. Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning facilities overcrowded</td>
<td>2. Lack of qualified teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>4. Lack of female staff at learning facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of female staff at learning facility</td>
<td>5. Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

- 5% of households reported having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education

EXPENDITURES

- 23% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 43). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 48 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 36 - results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 27%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 22% Severe (severity score 3)
- 8% Stress (severity score 2)
- 49% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 16% Not classified

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 26% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Safe areas for playing: 15%
- Education: 13%
- Health care: 8%
- Safety and security: 3%
- Child protection case management/social work support: 3%
- Food: 2%
- Psychosocial support: 2%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/girls

- Markets (7%)
- Latrines or bathing facilities (6%)
- Distribution sites (6%)
- In transportation (5%)
- On their way to different facilities (4%)

Men/boys

- Markets (5%)
- In transportation (5%)
- Distribution sites (1%)
- On their way to different facilities (2%)

- 6% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- Majhi: 79% would send, 2% would not send
- Camps-in-Charge (CICs): 78% would send, 1% would not send
- Health facilities: 22% would send, 2% would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 19% would send, 6% would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 16% would send, 6% would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 13% would send, 8% would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers: 11% would send, 6% would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 8% would send, 3% would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 8% would send, 3% would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 5% would send, 6% would not send
- None: 65% would not send
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1% would not send

Overall, 44% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 18%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:
- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 16% Severe (severity score 3)
- 3% Stress (severity score 2)
- 80% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION
- 10% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)
- 31% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan
- 36% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING
- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH
- 93% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING
- 84% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan
- 71% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS
- 20% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 101).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:** 14%

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**
- 14% Severe (severity score 3)
- 31% Stress (severity score 2)
- 50% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 5% Not classified

**WELLBEING**

49% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

82% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

**BARRIERS**

32% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

**Top 5 reported barriers**
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 15%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 11%
- No functional health facility nearby: 6%
- Older persons face difficulties accessing health facility: 4%
- Did not receive correct medications: 4%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
- 74% 0 - < 20 min
- 24% 20 - 30 min
- 2% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (97%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (3%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 101). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
Health

Expenditures

43% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- None: 57%
- > 0 - 500: 40%
- > 500 - 1000: 3%

Coping

27% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 25% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 28% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 26% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 25% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 28% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 26% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 20% of households.
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 9% of households.
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 3% of households.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 3% of households.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 2% of households.
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 0% of households.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 0% of households.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 12% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.
- 8% of households reported feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 101). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 107; n, latrines (males) = 105; n, bathing facilities (females) = 107; n, bathing facilities (males) = 105; n, learning facilities (girls) = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 103; n, food assistance = 108). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

66% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Non-food items: 51%
- Livelihoods: 45%
- Site management/development: 30%
- Remote education: 28%
- Shelter: 26%
- Protection services: 20%
- Nutrition services: 12%
- Health services: 11%
- Water: 10%
- Sanitation: 8%
- Food assistance: 4%

10% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 4%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 4%
- The information shared is irrelevant/no new information is shared: 3%
- No female staff providing information: 1%
- No door to door information sharing: 1%

93% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

59% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
2% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
7% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
18% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
6% Not consulted
8% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

9% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Don’t know how to read/write: 4%
- Older persons face challenges providing feedback: 3%
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 2%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 2%
- The process was too complicated: 1%
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 82%  

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 22%
- Severe (severity score 3): 60%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 17%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 80%
- Food security & livelihoods: 67%
- WASH: 67%
- Education: 61%
- Protection: 44%
- Health: 16%
- Nutrition: 12%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Access to food: 66%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 64%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 33%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 31%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 20%
- Household/cooking items: 19%
- Access to education: 17%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.73
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.41
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.58
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.55
5. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.35
6. Access to education: 0.33
7. Household/cooking items: 0.32

POPULATION PROFILE

- Female (50%): 15% Female, 85% Male
- Male (50%): 2% Age 60+, 13% Age 25-59, 10% Age 18-24, 6% Age 12-17, 10% Age 5-11, 7% Age 0-4

Average household size: 5.7 persons

Gender of head of household:

- Female: 15%
- Male: 85%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:

- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 8%
- After 24 August 2017: 92%

Gender of respondent:

- Female: 21%
- Male: 79%

Total number of household interviews: 110
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:

78%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHelter ISSUES & IMPROvEMENTS

78%

% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues

Leaks during rain 69%
Limited ventilation 33%
Lack of insulation from cold 7%
Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 5%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues

- Damage to roof 92%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 14%
- Damage to walls 14%

37% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

31% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

1% Extreme (severity score 4)
77% Severe (severity score 3)
8% Stress (severity score 2)
13% None or minimal (severity score 1)
1% Not classified

45% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs

- Replaced tarpaulin 43%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 18%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 15%
- Installed bracing 10%
- Repaired the walls 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 69%
- No money to pay for materials 44%
- No money to pay for labour 20%
- Materials are unavailable 5%
- No need to improve 27%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

69% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
61% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
# RENT PAYMENT

3% of households reported having had to **pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

# NON-FOOD ITEMS

**% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# COOKING FUEL

95% of households reported having **received LPG refills from humanitarian actors** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

40% of households reportedly having received LPG refills **reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.**

**% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):**

- Bought firewood: 56%
- Bought LPG refills: 38%
- Collected firewood: 15%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 3%

69% of households reported having incurred **expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase** (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

65% of households reported an **expenditure on fuel** in the 30 days prior to data collection.

# COPING

% of households among households reportedly **having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To repair or build shelter: 10%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 3%
- To pay electricity bill for solar batteries: 2%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 105).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 67%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/minimal / stress</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Consumption

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 6% Poor
- 46% Borderline
- 47% Acceptable

Food Assistance

60% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution 48%
- Long queues at distribution points 12%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits 11%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality 8%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport 7%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred 5%
- Lack of response when issues are reported 5%

Food Expenditure

98% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Food expenditure by range (BDT):

- None 2%
- > 0 - 500 1%
- > 500 - 1000 14%
- > 1000 - 2000 18%
- > 2000 - 5000 48%
- > 5000 17%

Livelihoods

68% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket). \(^1\)

- Below SMEB: 4%
- Between SMEB and MEB: 61%
- Above MEB: 35%

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection. \(^2\)

- To access or pay for food: 85%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To access or pay for education: 10%
- To repair or build shelter: 10%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To pay for ceremonies: 3%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection. \(^3\)

- Borrowing money to buy food: 49%
- Buying food on credit: 43%
- Spending savings: 36%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 12%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 11%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money: 12%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 9%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 5%
- Selling household goods: 20%
- Selling labour in advance: 2%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 2%
- Spending savings: 30%
- Spending productivity items: 3%
- Spending productive assets: 9%
- Spending household items for infrequent purchase: 2%
- Spending on clothes, shoes: 2%
- Spending on health: 2%
- Spending on education: 2%
- Spending on food: 1%
- Spending on shelter maintenance: 1%
- Spending on transport: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for infrequent purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
- Spending on non-food household items for regular purchase: 1%
- Spending on food items: 1%
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

**% of households with a WASH LSG:** 68%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

**% of households per WASH LSG severity score:**

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 64% Severe (severity score 3)
- 9% Stress (severity score 2)
- 23% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 96% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- 56% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

- 35% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose
  - Cooking: 12%
  - Personal hygiene at bathing location: 15%
  - Drinking: 15%
  - Personal hygiene at shelter: 21%
  - Other domestic purposes: 27%

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

- 61% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- Top 5 reported strategies:
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 55%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 11%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 9%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 6%
  - Reduce drinking water consumption: 5%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 47%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 26%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 23%
- VIP toilet: 3%
- Plastic bag and put in latrine after use: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- Females: 50%
- Males: 52%

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- Females: 21%
- Males: 19%

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 68%
- >1 bin at household level: 23%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 14%
- None: 5%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 52%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 29%
- Thrown in the open: 17%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 9%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 5%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 110; households with males, n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 56%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 51% Severe (severity score 3)
- 26% Stress (severity score 2)
- 10% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 7% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

- 60% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- 54% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.

- 40% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

- 69% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- 66% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

- 52% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- Girls
  - 14% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 13% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 12% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 10% Children cannot concentrate at home
  - 9% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children

- Boys
  - 16% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 14% Children cannot concentrate at home
  - 12% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 11% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
  - 10% Marriage

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 102; households with boys, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

**SENDING BACK**

- Of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open¹, 62%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back², 60%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back³, 42%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education before COVID-19 never enrolled</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of qualified teaching staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Children have fallen too far behind on learning</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID never enrolled</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Households do not consider education important</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

- Of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education⁵, 10%

**EXPENDITURES**

- Of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection, 36%

---

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
² The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
³ The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
⁴ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 77 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one child that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 60 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁵ The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 77 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one child that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 60 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
⁶ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**PROTECTION**

% of households with a protection LSG: **40%**

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (1)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

---

**CHILD NEEDS**

45% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative care</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- **Women/girls**
  - On their way to different facilities: 12%
  - Markets: 8%
  - Latrines or bathing facilities: 5%
  - Distribution sites: 5%
  - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 4%

- **Men/boys**
  - On their way to different facilities: 9%
  - Markets: 6%
  - Latrines or bathing facilities: 2%
  - Social/community areas: 2%
  - In transportation: 2%

20% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
PROTECTION

POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- Camps-in-Charge (CiCs): 77% Would send, 5% Would not send
- Majhi: 73% Would send, 4% Would not send
- Health facilities: 28% Would send, 0% Would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 23% Would send, 2% Would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 18% Would send, 15% Would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 17% Would send, 3% Would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 6% Would send, 7% Would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 5% Would send, 5% Would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 3% Would send, 0% Would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 0% Would send, 4% Would not send
- None: 68% Would not send, 0% Would not send
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 7% Would not send, 0% Would not send

Overall, 52% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

PROTECTION NEEDS

69% of households reported needing protection services or support

- Improved safety and security in general: 51%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 25%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 17%
- Access to justice and mediation: 5%

Overall, 52% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 12%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 12% Severe (severity score 3)
- 5% Stress (severity score 2)
- 80% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 3% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 13% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 21% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 32% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 95% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 83% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 30% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 106).
HEALTH

% of households with a health LSG: 13%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Severe (severity score 3): 13%
- Stress (severity score 2): 31%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 55%
- Not classified: 2%

WELLBEING

58% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

55% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

BARRIERS

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 35%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 24%
- No functional health facility nearby: 13%
- Did not receive correct medications: 10%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility: 5%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 80%
- 20 - 30 min: 19%
- > 30 min: 1%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (96%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (2%).

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

87% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 72%
- Private clinic: 30%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 21%
- Traditional/community healer: 2%
- Government clinic: 1%

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 135). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
### HEALTH

#### EXPENDITURES

39% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 61%
- > 0 - 500: 34%
- > 500 - 1000: 3%
- > 1000 - 2000: 0%
- > 2000 - 5000: 0%
- > 5000: 2%

#### COPING

30% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- Of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. 
  - 39% of households with adult women reported adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

- Of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
  - 33% of households with adult men reported adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

- Of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
  - 33% of households with children reported children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 27% of households reported this challenge.
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 26% of households reported this challenge.
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 8% of households reported this challenge.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 7% of households reported this challenge.
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 6% of households reported this challenge.
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 3% of households reported this challenge.
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 2% of households reported this challenge.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

- 94% of households reported their opinions and concerns are being heard.
- 5% of households reported their opinions and concerns are not being heard.
- 2% of households do not know / prefer not to answer.

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- Latrines (females): 19%
- Latrines (males): 17%
- Health care: 13%
- Bathing facilities (females): 10%
- Food assistance: 7%
- Bathing facilities (males): 6%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- Latrines (females): 9%
- Latrines (males): 6%
- Health care: 2%
- Bathing facilities (males): 3%
- Bathing facilities (females): 2%
- Learning facilities (girls): 1%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 109). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 110; n, latrines (males) = 108; n, bathing facilities (females) = 110; n, bathing facilities (males) = 108; n, learning facilities (girls) = 69 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, health care = 108; n, food assistance = 110). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

82% of households reported **not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting **not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information**, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 69%
- Livelihoods: 49%
- Shelter: 35%
- Remote education: 31%
- Site management/development: 31%
- Protection services: 23%
- Water: 13%
- Health services: 11%
- Sanitation: 8%
- Nutrition services: 5%
- Food assistance: 4%

26% of households reported having **faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 12%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 7%
- No door to door information sharing: 7%
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 5%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 4%

95% of households reported having been **able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been **able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19** in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting **having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account** related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- 73% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
- 5% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
- 7% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
- 5% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
- 9% Not consulted
- 1% Don't know / prefer not to answer

11% of households reported having **faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints** on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- The process was too complicated: 5%
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 4%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 4%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 3%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 88%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 16%
- Severe (severity score 3): 72%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 11%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Food security & livelihoods: 59%
- WASH: 59%
- Shelter & non-food items: 55%
- Education: 53%
- Protection: 35%
- Health: 6%
- Nutrition: 5%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Access to food: 59%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 51%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 41%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 30%
- Household/cooking items: 25%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 19%
- Clothing: 16%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.65
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.11
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.81
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.46
5. Household/cooking items: 0.39
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.36
7. Access to education: 0.22

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 5.4 persons

Gender of head of household:

- Female: 19%
- Male: 81%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:

- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 1%
- After 24 August 2017: 99%

Gender of respondent:

- Female: 20%
- Male: 80%

Total number of household interviews: 110

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 97).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 54%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

57% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain: 49%
- Limited ventilation: 17%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 15%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 1%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof: 85%
- Materials don’t insulate: 18%
- Materials trap heat: 16%

32% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

21% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

39% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:
- Replaced tarpaulin: 25%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 16%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 15%
- Repaired/upgraded the floor: 7%
- Installed bracing: 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 45%
- No money to pay for materials: 30%
- Materials are unavailable: 3%
- No money to pay for labour: 3%
- No need to improve: 48%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:
- 79% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 47% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 43). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

% of households reporting having insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:
- Fans: 87%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 66%
- Shoes: 55%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 53%
- Blankets: 45%
- Kitchen sets: 37%
- Mosquito nets: 35%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 31%

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 19%
- To access or pay for household items: 6%
- To repair or build shelter: 4%
- To pay rent: 1%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4)
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection. The top 7 reported challenges were:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 41%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 10%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 9%
- Long queues at distribution points: 9%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 5%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 5%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 3%

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

To access or pay for food 91%
To access or pay for healthcare 25%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 19%
To access or pay for education 8%
To access or pay for household items 6%
To repair or build shelter 4%
To access or pay for hygiene items 3%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted... 

...stress coping strategies3, 4 67%
...crisis coping strategies3, 5 22%
...emergency coping strategies3, 6 0%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 57%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 1%
- Severe (severity score 3): 56%
- Stress (severity score 2): 9%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 33%
- Not classified: 1%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 95% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 57% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

- 12% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

- 26% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water.

- Top 5 reported strategies:
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 25%
  - Reduce drinking water consumption: 4%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 3%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 2%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 1%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 110; households with males, n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options.

Households could select multiple options.

### Sanitation Facilities

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 48%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 34%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 15%
- **VIP toilet**: 3%

### Bathing Facilities

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females

1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 37%
2. Latrines are too far: 15%
3. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 11%
4. Latrines are not functioning: 8%
5. Latrines are difficult to reach: 6%

#### Males

1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 28%
2. Latrines are too far: 14%
3. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 13%
4. Latrines are not functioning: 11%
5. Latrines are difficult to reach: 8%

### Wasting Management

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

1. 1 bin at household level: 67%
2. > 1 bin at household level: 24%
3. Access to communal bin/pit: 17%
4. None: 2%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 58%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 34%
- Throws waste in the open: 7%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 14%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 2%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 110; households with males, n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 52%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%
- Severe (severity score 3): 49%
- Stress (severity score 2): 27%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 19%
- Not classified: 2%

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

44% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- Girls: 47%
- Boys: 29%

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

52% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- Girls: 55%
- Boys: 39%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Reason</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children cannot concentrate at home</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Children too old to participate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 89 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 87 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

% of households with at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

- **Girls**: 44%
- **Boys**: 31%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back

- **Girls**: 47%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back

- **Boys**: 6%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open

- **Girls**: 44%
- **Boys**: 31%

Top 5 reported challenges

Girls

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (8%)
2. No appropriate learning content provided for younger children (4%)
3. Children do not understand language of materials/classes (4%)
4. Children have fallen too far behind on learning (2%)
5. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (2%)

Boys

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (5%)
2. No appropriate learning content provided for younger children (3%)
3. Children do not understand language of materials/classes (3%)
4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (2%)
5. No appropriate learning content provided for older children (2%)

COPING

8% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

24% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 44 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 50 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 34% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

SAFETY & SECURITY

- 5% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women/girls</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5 reported areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>In own shelter (at home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own shelter (at home)</td>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- Camps-in-Charge (CiCs): 89% would send, 2% would not send
- Majhi: 78% would send, 1% would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 26% would send, 5% would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 22% would send, 1% would not send
- Health facilities: 14% would send, 3% would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 11% would send, 3% would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 6% would send, 5% would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 5% would send, 1% would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 4% would send, 6% would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 2% would send, 3% would not send
- None: 74% would not send
- Don't know / prefer not to answer: 0% would send, 7% would not send

Overall, 44% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 6%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 0%
- Severe (severity score 3): 6%
- Stress (severity score 2): 5%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 88%
- Not classified: 1%

CHILD NUTRITION

- 11% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 11% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 40% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 87% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 74% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 21% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 103).
% of households with a health LSG: 7%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 7% Severe (severity score 3)
- 32% Stress (severity score 2)
- 61% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

WELLBEING
- 53% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR
- 93% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.
- 79% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:
  - NGO clinic: 77%
  - Private clinic: 28%
  - Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 12%
  - Government clinic: 9%
  - Traditional/community healer: 1%

BARRIERS
- 45% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care:
  - Top 5 reported barriers:
    - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 31%
    - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 21%
    - Did not receive correct medications: 10%
    - No functional health facility nearby: 7%
    - Older persons face difficulties accessing health facility: 5%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES
- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 79% 0 - < 20 min
  - 20% 20 - 30 min
  - 1% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (94%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (5%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 113). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

35% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

65% - None
35% - > 0 - 500
1% - > 500 - 1000

COPING

25% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- Of households with adult women reported that **adult women** in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- Of households with adult men reported that **adult men** in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- Of households with children reported that **children** in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

**Most commonly reported challenges**

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 23%, 26%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 19%, 20%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 7%, 3%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 6%, 6%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 2%, 1%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1%, 3%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 0%, 0%

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 92%
- No: 6%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 2%

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 13%
- Food assistance: 10%
- Health care: 10%
- Latrines (males): 8%
- Bathing facilities (males): 7%
- Bathing facilities (females): 5%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 6%
- Latrines (males): 4%
- Bathing facilities (females): 4%
- Learning facilities (girls): 2%
- Food assistance: 2%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Health care: 0%
- Bathing facilities (males): 0%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 109). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 101). Households could select up to 5 options.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 110; n, latrines (males) = 106; n, bathing facilities (females) = 110; n, bathing facilities (males) = 106; n, learning facilities (girls) = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 110; n, food assistance = 110). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
Households were asked separately about each type of service.

Households could select up to 3 options.

Households could select up to 5 options.

### COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

#### ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 71% of households reported **not having been able to access (receive and understand)** enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 66% of households reporting **having been consulted** and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 9% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

#### Top 5 reported problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection:

1. Aid workers do not share/disclose: 5%
2. Information isn’t shared often enough: 4%
3. The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 2%
4. Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%
5. Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information: 1%

#### Top 4 reported challenges when providing feedback or complaints:

1. Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 5%
2. No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
3. Older persons face challenges providing feedback: 2%
4. Language barriers: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 81%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 19%
- Severe (severity score 3): 62%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 19%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 66%
- Food security & livelihoods: 64%
- WASH: 55%
- Education: 51%
- Protection: 33%
- Nutrition: 10%
- Health: 8%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.87
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.40
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.55
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.52
5. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.43
6. Household/cooking items: 0.37
7. Access to education: 0.22

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 23%
- Male: 77%

Average household size: 5.5 persons

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 0%
- After 24 August 2017: 100%

Total number of household interviews: 108
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 59%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 59% Severe (severity score 3)
- 16% Stress (severity score 2)
- 25% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

64% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 58%
- Limited ventilation 17%
- Lack of insulation from cold 16%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 90%
- Materials don’t insulate 17%
- Materials trap heat 12%

28% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

25% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 60% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 56% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 45). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
**RENT PAYMENT**

1% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**NON-FOOD ITEMS**

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 64%
- Shoes: 48%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 45%
- Kitchen sets: 37%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 37%
- Mosquito nets: 34%
- Blankets: 30%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 21%

**COOKING FUEL**

98% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

53% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):

- Bought firewood: 62%
- Bought LPG refills: 19%
- Collected firewood: 13%

54% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

46% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**COPING**

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 24%
- To repair or build shelter: 6%
- To access or pay for household items: 4%
- To pay rent: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 106).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

% of households with a food security LSG: 57%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 9% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 48% Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 4% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score

- 6% Poor
- 36% Borderline
- 57% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- 30% > 0 - 500
- 17% > 500 - 1000
- 5% > 1000 - 2000
- 54% > 2000 - 5000
- 22% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

33% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges

- Food items do not last until next distribution 30%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits 9%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality 7%
- Long queues at distribution points 6%
- Harassment of women/girls at distribution sites 2%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred 1%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport 1%

LIVELIHOODS

91% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Coping Strategy</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for food</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for healthcare</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for clothes, shoes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for education</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To repair or build shelter</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for household items</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To access or pay for water</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

66% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.\(^3\)

- Borrowing money to buy food: 46% (54%)
- Buying food on credit: 44% (56%)
- Spending savings: 35% (1% - 66%)
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 6% (97%)
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 3% (96%)
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money: 2% (96%)
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 1% (93%)
- Selling jewelry/gold: 7% (93%)
- Selling household goods: 6% (82%)
- Selling labour in advance: 5% (96%)
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 2% (72%)
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 2% (94%)
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 1% (99%)
- Entire household migrated: 1% (100%)
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 1% (98%)
- Child marriage: 0% (97%)
- Begging: 100%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies:

- Stress coping strategies: 65%
- Crisis coping strategies: 15%
- Emergency coping strategies: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

2 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

3 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money; food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

4 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 56%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 54% Severe (severity score 3)
- 8% Stress (severity score 2)
- 36% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 99% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 44% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER SOURCE
% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)
- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 50%
- Deep tubewell: 23%
- Shallow tubewell: 22%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 5%

WATER QUANTITIES
% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

COPING
% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water
- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 19%
- Buy drinking water from vendors: 3%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 2%
- Reduce drinking water consumption: 2%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 1%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 56%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 25%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 13%
- VIP toilet: 5%
- Open defecation: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 32%
Males: 33%

Top 5 reported problems

1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: Females 21%, Males 21%
2. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: Females 19%, Males 19%
3. Latrines are too far: Females 10%, Males 10%
4. Lack of light inside latrines: Females 6%, Males 6%
5. Latrines are not functioning: Females 5%, Males 5%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 14%
Males: 12%

Top 4 reported problems

1. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: Females 8%, Males 8%
2. Bathing facilities are too far: Females 5%, Males 3%
3. Bathing facilities are not functioning: Females 2%, Males 2%
4. Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: Females 2%, Males 2%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

1 bin at household level: 65%
> 1 bin at household level: 12%
Access to communal bin/pit: 23%
None: 3%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

Bin at household level (segmented): 56%
Bin at household level (not segregated): 23%
Throws waste in the open: 6%
Communal bin/pit (segmented): 6%
Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 16%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 108; households with males, n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 45%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

50% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 49%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 33%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

51% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 49%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 34%

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

Girls

- 18% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 15% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 12% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 9% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 9% Children too old to participate

Boys

- 14% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 12% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 12% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 10% Marriage
- 8% Lack of quality learning materials at home

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 93 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 92 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
SENDING BACK

of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open¹

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back²

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back³

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 51 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back⁴

Top 5 reported challenges

Girls

Boys

2% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

1 Children are too young still

4%

2% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

2 No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

1%

2% Household does not consider education important

3 Marriage

1%

2% Children are too young still

4 Children are too old now

1%

2% Lack of gender segregation at learning facility

5

EXPENDITURES

of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

10% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education⁵

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 51 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 55 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 67 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 28%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 7% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 20% Severe (severity score 3)
- 3% Stress (severity score 2)
- 57% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 12% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

27% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- Education 19%
- Safe areas for playing 13%
- Food 9%
- Shelter 6%
- Safety and security 5%
- Psychosocial support 2%
- Alternative care 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/girls

- 7% In own shelter (at home)
- 6% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 5% Social/community areas
- 2% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 1% Markets

Men/boys

- 4% In own shelter (at home)
- 2% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 2% Social/community areas
- 1% Community kitchen
- 1% In own shelter (at home)

Households could select multiple options.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

- **Majhi**: 90% (3%)
- **Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)**: 85% (0%)
- **Health facilities**: 22% (7%)
- **Law enforcement officials**: 19% (7%)
- **Ombudsman/national human rights institutions**: 11% (6%)
- **Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres**: 5% (8%)
- **Legal aid service providers**: 4% (3%)
- **Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms**: 3% (4%)
- **Psychosocial service providers**: 2% (4%)
- **Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives**: 2% (3%)
- **None**: 72% (0%)
- **Don't know / prefer not to answer**: 0% (6%)

Overall, 40% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
## NUTRITION

### % of households with a nutrition LSG:

9%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILD NUTRITION

- **10%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- **16%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- **47%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

### MESSAGING

- **89%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

### OVERALL REACH

- **95%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

### CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- **87%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

### ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- **84%** of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

- **22%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 103).

---

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.
% of households with a health LSG: 7%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 7% Severe
- 36% Stress
- 56% None or minimal
- 0% Not classified

WELLBEING
51% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR
90% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:
- NGO clinic: 71%
- Private clinic: 25%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 23%
- Government clinic: 9%
- Traditional/community healer: 3%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES
% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
- 0 - < 20 min: 80%
- 20 - 30 min: 18%
- > 30 min: 3%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (95%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (5%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 92). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

35% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- None: 65%
- > 0 - 500: 35%

COPING

25% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

### MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **27%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.

- **22%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

- **24%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

#### Most commonly reported challenges

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 21%, 17%, 22%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 14%, 10%, 9%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 7%, 4%, NA
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 2%, 2%, 2%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 1%, 0%, 3%

### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- **92%** of households reported feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives. 92% Yes, 7% No, 1% Don’t know / prefer not to answer.

### ACCESSING SERVICES

- **% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them**

  - Latrines (males): 10%
  - Latrines (females): 10%
  - Health care: 6%
  - Bathing facilities (females): 5%
  - Bathing facilities (males): 3%
  - Food assistance: 1%

- **% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them**

  - Latrines (males): 2%
  - Latrines (females): 3%
  - Learning facilities (girls): 0%
  - Learning facilities (boys): 0%
  - Food assistance: 0%
  - Health care: 0%
  - Bathing facilities (males): 0%
  - Bathing facilities (females): 0%
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

68% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 39% Non-food items
- 33% Livelihoods
- 28% Site management/development
- 25% Remote education
- 23% Shelter
- 13% Nutrition services
- 11% Protection services
- 7% Water
- 7% Health services
- 3% Sanitation
- 1% Food assistance

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service¹

6% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection².

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 3%
- No female staff providing information: 2%
- No door to door information sharing: 2%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%
- Don't know where to get information/ who to ask: 1%

Top 5 reported problems

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 70% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
- 14% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
- 6% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
- 5% Not consulted

4% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection³.

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 2%
- Language barriers: 1%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 1%
- Asked for money when providing feedback: 1%

Top 4 reported challenges

¹ Households were asked separately about each type of service.
² Households could select up to 3 options.
³ Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 83%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 29%
- Severe (severity score 3): 55%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 16%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 81%
- Food security & livelihoods: 74%
- WASH: 63%
- Protection: 43%
- Education: 40%
- Health: 16%
- Nutrition: 7%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 69%
- Access to food: 64%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 27%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 26%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 24%
- Household/cooking items: 22%
- Access to education: 19%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.63
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.54
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.57
4. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.45
5. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.40
6. Access to education: 0.33
7. Household/cooking items: 0.31

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 5.6 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 17%
- Male: 83%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 2%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 7%
- After 24 August 2017: 91%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 24%
- Male: 76%

Total number of household interviews: 108

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 90). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: **77%**

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 75% Severe (severity score 3)
- 13% Stress (severity score 2)
- 9% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

**SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS**

80% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

- Leaks during rain: 71%
- Limited ventilation: 19%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 18%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 87%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 20%
- Damage to walls: 17%

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 75% Severe (severity score 3)
- 13% Stress (severity score 2)
- 9% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**Top 5 reported improvements/repairs**

- Replaced tarpaulin: 42%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 20%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 19%
- Repaired the walls: 9%
- Installed bracing: 8%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 66%
- No money to pay for materials: 40%
- Materials are unavailable: 9%
- No money to pay for labour: 4%
- No need to improve: 28%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 43% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 74% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 106).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection (top 5)

Bought firewood 74%
Bought LPG refills 13%
Collected firewood 13%
Shelter materials used as firewood 2%
Charcoal or similar 2%

of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection (top 5)

Bought firewood 74%
Bought LPG refills 13%
Collected firewood 13%
Shelter materials used as firewood 2%
Charcoal or similar 2%

of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection (top 5)

54%
59%

of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection (top 5)

Bought firewood 74%
Bought LPG refills 13%
Collected firewood 13%
Shelter materials used as firewood 2%
Charcoal or similar 2%

of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection (top 5)

54%
59%
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 9% Poor
- 46% Borderline
- 44% Acceptable

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 19% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 52% Severe (severity score 3)
- 26% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 4% Not classified

Food consumption:
- 98% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

Food expenditure:
- % of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
  - > 0 - 500: 2%
  - > 500 - 1000: 3%
  - > 1000 - 2000: 8%
  - > 2000 - 5000: 19%
  - > 5000: 48%

Food assistance:
- 67% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection
- Top 7 reported challenges:
  - Food items do not last until next distribution: 44%
  - Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 16%
  - Long queues at distribution points: 15%
  - Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 12%
  - Items received through distributions are of low quality: 9%
  - Items received through distributions are less preferred: 7%
  - Lack of clarity on food entitlements: 5%

Livelihoods:
- 65% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).  

- Below SMEB: 12%
- Between SMEB and MEB: 50%
- Above MEB: 38%

Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) in the 30 days prior to data collection.  

- To access or pay for food: 84%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To repair or build shelter: 13%
- To access or pay for education: 11%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 2%
- To access or pay for household items: 2%

Adopted coping strategy

Exhausted coping strategy

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

**% of households with a WASH LSG:** 62%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

**% of households per WASH LSG severity score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 100% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 58% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**WATER QuANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection:

- Drinking: 11%
- Cooking: 18%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 25%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 28%
- Other domestic purposes: 36%

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

1. Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 3)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 50%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 23%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 23%
- VIP toilet: 4%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far: 15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach: 11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are not functioning: 9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far: 10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning: 4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

| 1 bin at household level (segregated): 65% |
| > 1 bin at household level (segregated): 14% |
| Access to communal bin/pit (segregated): 25% |
| None: 6% |

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

| Bin at household level (segregated): 50% |
| Bin at household level (not segregated): 22% |
| Throws waste in the open: 15% |
| Communal bin/pit (segregated): 14% |
| Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 8% |
% of households with a education LSG: 41%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4) 6%
- Severe (severity score 3) 34%
- Stress (severity score 2) 38%
- None or minimal (severity score 1) 17%
- Not classified 5%

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

49% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled in learning facilities** before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 44%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 28%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

54% of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 49%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 34%

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting **challenges** girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefiting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.

- **Girls**
  - 17% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 14% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 11% Children too old to participate
  - 8% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 7% Children cannot concentrate at home

- **Boys**
  - 15% Children too old to participate
  - 14% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 9% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 9% Marriage
  - 9% Lack of quality learning materials at home

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 89). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 88 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

**SENDING BACK**

- % of households with at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open: 54%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back: 46%
- % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back: 37%

- % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open: 54% (Girls), 38% (Boys)
- % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open: 46% (Girls), 37% (Boys)

**Top 5 reported challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Girls (%)</th>
<th>Boys (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children needed to help at home</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

- % of households reported having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection: 11%

**EXPENDITURES**

- % of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection: 41%
% of households with a protection LSG: 39%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 8% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 31% Severe (severity score 3)
- 9% Stress (severity score 2)
- 38% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 14% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

38% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Education 32%
- Safe areas for playing 15%
- Food 14%
- Health care 8%
- Safety and security 6%
- Child protection case management/social work support 4%
- Shelter 3%

SAFETY & SECURITY

24% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

Women/boys

- 14% On their way to different facilities
- 9% Markets
- 8% Distribution sites
- 4% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 3% Social/community areas
- 3% On the way to collect firewood

Women/girls

- 24% Top 5 reported areas

Men/boys

- 20% On their way to different facilities
- 10% Markets
- 6% In transportation
- 3% Social/community areas
- 3% On the way to collect firewood

9% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
## PROTECTION

### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROTECTION NEEDS

83% of households reported needing protection services or support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Needed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 39% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
## NUTRITION

### % of households with a nutrition LSG:

- **6%**

**see Annex 1 for details on methodology**

### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- **2%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **4%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **3%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **86%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **6%** Not classified

---

### CHILD NUTRITION

- **8%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- **8%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- **39%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### MESSAGING

- **94%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### OVERALL REACH

- **100%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

### CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- **88%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- **78%** of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- **17%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

---

**The mother-led MUAC programme** is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 102).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: 13%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 13% Severe (severity score 3)
- 53% Stress (severity score 2)
- 32% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

78% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

91% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- 73% NGO clinic
- 35% Private clinic
- 13% Pharmacy or drug shop in the market
- 3% Government clinic

---

**BARRIERS**

65% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- 29% Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded
- 27% Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable
- 16% Did not receive correct medications
- 14% No functional health facility nearby
- 8% Health services are too far away/lack of transport

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- 46% 0 - < 20 min
- 45% 20 - 30 min
- 8% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (92%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (8%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 181). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

53% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 0 - 500 (47%)
- 500 - 1000 (44%)
- 1000 - 2000 (5%)
- 2000 - 5000 (2%)

COPING

30% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.¹

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

1 of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

2 of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

3 of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

4 of households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 108; n, latrines (males) = 105; n, bathing facilities (females) = 108; n, bathing facilities (males) = 105; n, learning facilities (girls) = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; n, learning facilities (boys) = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; n, health care = 106; n, food assistance = 106). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.

Most commonly reported challenges

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 28% (25% - 33%)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 26% (19% - 22%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 13% (7% - 8%)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 8% (9% - NA)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 5% (4% - 5%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 2% (1% - 1%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 1% (3% - 9%)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them


1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 101). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 108; n, latrines (males) = 105; n, bathing facilities (females) = 108; n, bathing facilities (males) = 105; n, learning facilities (girls) = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; n, learning facilities (boys) = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; n, health care = 106; n, food assistance = 106). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

Of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Non-food items: 49%
- Livelihoods: 43%
- Site management/development: 33%
- Shelter: 32%
- Protection services: 19%
- Remote education: 18%
- Water: 13%
- Health services: 13%
- Food assistance: 5%
- Nutrition services: 4%
- Sanitation: 1%

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- 68% overall

Of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Top 5 reported problems:
  - Aid workers do not share/disclose
  - No door to door information sharing
  - Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information
  - The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared
  - Information isn't shared often enough

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- 71% consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
- 2% consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
- 8% consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
- 9% consulted but opinion not taken into account
- 8% not consulted
- 1% don’t know / prefer not to answer

Of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- 14% overall

- Top 5 reported challenges:
  - Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback
  - The process was too complicated
  - No response/reaction received to feedback
  - Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely
  - Had fear about confidentiality

Notes:
1. Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2. Households could select up to 3 options.
3. Households could select up to 5 options.
### MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

#### % of households with multi-sectoral needs: 91%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology.

### Priorities for 2022

**Shelter materials/upgrade**
- 60%

**Access to food**
- 41%

**Electricity/solar lamps/batteries**
- 35%

**Access to self-reliance activities**
- 33%

**Access to safe and functional latrines**
- 31%

**Access to clean drinking water**
- 26%

**Household/cooking items**
- 21%

#### Average household size 5.3 persons

#### Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

#### Gender of respondent:
- Female (21%)
- Male (79%)

#### Total number of household interviews: 117

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 106).
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (1)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain 59%
- Limited ventilation 32%
- Lack of insulation from cold 12%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 8%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 9%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues2,3:
- Damage to roof 84%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 24%
- Damage to walls 19%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs4:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 56%
- No money to pay for materials 37%
- No money to pay for labour 6%
- Materials are unavailable 1%
- No need to improve 41%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs4:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 56%
- No money to pay for materials 37%
- No money to pay for labour 6%
- Materials are unavailable 1%
- No need to improve 41%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...3,5:
- 78% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 61% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 49). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
### RENT PAYMENT

2% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIs</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COOKING FUEL

100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 62% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Sources of Cooking Fuel</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bought firewood</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected firewood</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought LPG refills</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials used as firewood</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene or other combustible</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COPING

- 57% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 43% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### Households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 13%
- To pay electricity bill/or solar batteries: 6%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 117).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 45). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

16% Poor
42% Borderline
42% Acceptable

% of households by Food Consumption Score

Food Assistance

44% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection. The top 7 reported challenges are:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 35%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 8%
- Long queues at distribution points: 7%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 6%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 5%
- Distribution points are too far (lack of transport): 5%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 2%

Food Expenditure

99% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection. The breakdown by range (BDT) is as follows:

- None: 1%
- > 0 - 500: 3%
- > 500 - 1000: 8%
- > 1000 - 2000: 20%
- > 2000 - 5000: 49%
- > 5000: 20%

Livelihoods

71% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- 3% Below SMEB
- 61% Between SMEB and MEB
- 23% Above MEB

* Including imputed amount of assistance
* Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.2

- To access or pay for food: 87%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 36%
- To access or pay for education: 19%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 13%
- To access or pay for electricity bill/solar batteries: 6%
- To access or pay for hygiene items: 5%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.3

- Borrowing money to buy food: 46%
- Buying food on credit: 52%
- Spending savings: 52%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 15%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 32%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money: 13%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 15%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 9%
- Selling household goods: 15%
- Selling labour in advance: 15%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 7%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 25%
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 20%
- Entire household migrated: 20%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 20%
- Child marriage: 9%
- Begging: 100%

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies:

- Stress coping strategies: 70%
- Crisis coping strategies: 35%
- Emergency coping strategies: 3%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (e.g. agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 67%  

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:  
- Extreme (severity score 4): 3%  
- Severe (severity score 3): 64%  
- Stress (severity score 2): 14%  
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 19%  
- Not classified: 1%  

HYGIENE ITEMS  
- 97% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection  
- 50% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection  

WATER QUANTITIES  
% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection  

- Drinking: 15%  
- Cooking: 17%  
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 24%  
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 32%  
- Other domestic purposes: 34%  

COPING  
% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water  
- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 48%  
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 10%  
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 9%  
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 9%  
- Reduce drinking water consumption: 3%  

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

**SANITATION FACILITIES**

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 61%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 16%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 14%
- VIP toilet: 8%
- Bucket toilet and put in latrine after: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BATHING FACILITIES**

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 bin at household level</th>
<th>&gt; 1 bin at household level</th>
<th>Access to communal bin/pit</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bin at household level (segregated)</th>
<th>Bin at household level (not segregated)</th>
<th>Throws waste in the open</th>
<th>Communal bin/pit (segregated)</th>
<th>Communal bin/pit (not segregated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 117; households with males, n = 116). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 50%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 45% Severe (severity score 3)
- 30% Stress (severity score 2)
- 17% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 3% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

36% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- Girls: 36%
- Boys: 60%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

45% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- Girls: 44%
- Boys: 33%

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- Girls:
  - Marriage and/or pregnancy: 21%
  - No home-based learning offered: 8%
  - Lack of guidance from learning facilitators: 7%
  - Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 6%

- Boys:
  - Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 17%
  - Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 10%
  - Marriage: 10%
  - Household does not consider education important: 9%
  - No space for children to study in shelter: 7%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 106; households with boys, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

44% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)

44% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)

27% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43% Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>36% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>20% Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>18% Household does not consider education important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Children are too old now</td>
<td>12% Children needed to help at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Inaccessibility</td>
<td>5% Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^5\)

Girls

19% Top 5 reported challenges

Boys

18%

10% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

5% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

3% Marriage and/or pregnancy

Children working outside the home

2% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

Inaccessibility

COPING

19% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^6\)

EXPENDITURES

32% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 70 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 50 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 62 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**CHILD NEEDS**

43% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Safe areas for playing: 22%
- Education: 21%
- Safety and security: 9%
- Food: 6%
- Health care: 4%
- Shelter: 3%
- Psychosocial support: 3%

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Women/girls: 29%
- Men/boys: 20%

- Top 5 reported areas:
  - Women/girls:
    - Latrines or bathing facilities: 13%
    - On their way to different facilities: 9%
    - In transportation: 5%
    - Distribution sites: 3%
  - Men/boys:
    - Latrines or bathing facilities: 8%
    - On their way to different facilities: 8%
    - Markets: 4%
    - In transportation: 4%
    - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 3%

16% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

---

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

- Majhi: 79% would send, 2% would not send
- Camps-in-Charge (CICs): 75% would send, 7% would not send
- Health facilities: 19% would send, 0% would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 17% would send, 2% would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 15% would send, 17% would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 9% would send, 5% would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 4% would send, 4% would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 3% would send, 3% would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 3% would send, 3% would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 1% would send, 4% would not send
- None: 54% would not send
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 0% would send, 12% would not send

Overall, 34% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 8%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

9% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

11% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

19% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

83% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

69% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

21% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 111).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:** 7%

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- 7% Severe (severity score 3)
- 32% Stress (severity score 2)
- 61% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

63% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

92% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic 83%
- Private clinic 26%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market 21%
- Government clinic 2%
- Traditional/ community healer 2%

---

**BARRIERS**

40% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable 23%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded 18%
- No functional health facility nearby 9%
- Did not receive correct medications 9%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport 6%

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 73% 0 - < 20 min
- 26% 20 - 30 min
- 2% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (92%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (7%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 136). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

37% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 63% None
- 36% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000

COPING

36% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- **37%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- **35%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- **33%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 27%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 14%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 10%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 8%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 6%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 3%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 1%

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 84%
- No: 15%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Health care: 13%
- Bathing facilities (females): 11%
- Latrines (males): 10%
- Latrines (females): 9%
- Bathing facilities (males): 8%
- Food assistance: 5%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 13%
- Latrines (males): 11%
- Learning facilities (girls): 6%
- Bathing facilities (females): 4%
- Health care: 3%
- Bathing facilities (males): 3%
- Food assistance: 2%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 117). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 117; n, latrines (males) = 116; n, bathing facilities (females) = 117; n, bathing facilities (males) = 116; n, learning facilities (girls) = 67 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; n, learning facilities (boys) = 48 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error; n, health care = 117; n, food assistance = 116). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

87% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 72%
- Livelihoods: 56%
- Remote education: 44%
- Shelter: 42%
- Site management/development: 38%
- Protection services: 28%
- Nutrition services: 19%
- Water: 16%
- Health services: 11%
- Sanitation: 9%
- Food assistance: 3%

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 18%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 7%
- Don't know where to get information/ who to ask: 5%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 4%
- Information isn't shared often enough: 3%

94% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

98% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

64% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
7% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
7% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
8% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
10% Not consulted
4% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

Top 5 reported challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 8%
- The process was too complicated: 3%
- Language barriers: 3%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 3%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 2%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 84%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 21%
- Severe (severity score 3): 63%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 2%
- Not classified: 12%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Food security & livelihoods: 82%
- Shelter & non-food items: 71%
- WASH: 57%
- Education: 51%
- Protection: 29%
- Nutrition: 15%
- Health: 13%

Priority Needs
% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 63%
- Access to food: 62%
- Household/cooking items: 41%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 34%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 29%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 15%
- Access to clean drinking water: 13%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.79
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.40
3. Household/cooking items: 0.65
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.55
5. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.50
6. Access to clean drinking water: 0.27
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.24

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

Gender of respondent:
- Female (78%)
- Male (22%)

Average household size: 5.4 persons

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 100%
- After 24 August 2017: 0%

Total number of household interviews: 141

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 119).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
5 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues \( n = 91 \). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements \( n = 73 \). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements \( n = 68 \). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

### SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

- **67%** of households reported at least one shelter issue

  - **61%** (Leaks during rain)
  - **15%** (Limited ventilation)
  - **8%** (Lack of insulation from cold)
  - **4%** (Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor))
  - **3%** (Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there)

  - **95%** (Damage to roof)
  - **15%** (Damage to windows and/or doors)
  - **9%** (Damage to walls)

- **31%** of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

- **36%** of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

### % of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:

- **67%**

  - **2%** (Extreme) (severity score 4)
  - **65%** (Severe) (severity score 3)
  - **13%** (Stress) (severity score 2)
  - **21%** (None or minimal) (severity score 1)
  - **0%** (Not classified)

### % of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

#### Top 5 reported improvements/repairs\(^3\) to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

- **41%** Replaced tarpaulin
- **23%** Repaired/upgraded the roof structure
- **15%** Tied down the roof/shelter
- **6%** Installed bracing
- **3%** Installed gutter

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements/repairs.

#### % of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs\(^4\)

- **56%** Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations
- **41%** No money to pay for materials
- **11%** No money to pay for labour
- **1%** Materials are unavailable
- **40%** No need to improve

#### Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...\(^3\), \(^5\)

- **66%** reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- **69%** reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

\(^1\) Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues \( n = 91 \). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

\(^3\) Households could select multiple options.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements \( n = 73 \). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements \( n = 68 \). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

RENT PAYMENT

6% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 84%
- Shoes: 77%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 62%
- Mosquito nets: 59%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 50%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 49%
- Blankets: 48%
- Kitchen sets: 45%

COOKING FUEL

96% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

56% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

- Bought firewood: 63%
- Collected firewood: 26%
- Bought LPG refills: 12%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

52% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

49% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 16%
- To repair or build shelter: 4%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 135).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 74%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (severity score 4)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (severity score 3)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/minimal/stress (severity score 1 or 2)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 5% Poor
- 52% Borderline
- 43% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

- 99% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

- % of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)
  - None: 1%
  - > 0 - 500: 4%
  - > 500 - 1000: 5%
  - > 1000 - 2000: 24%
  - > 2000 - 5000: 54%
  - > 5000: 11%

FOOD ASSISTANCE

- 45% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 36%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 6%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 6%
- Long queues at distribution points: 6%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 5%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 2%
- Inaccessibility (e.g. due to road conditions): 2%

LIVELIHOODS

- 70% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket). Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 6) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households refers to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 56%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 52% Severe (severity score 3)
- 9% Stress (severity score 2)
- 35% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 94% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- 52% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

- 29% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose
  - Purpose
    - Cooking
    - Drinking
    - Personal hygiene at shelter
    - Personal hygiene at bathing location
    - Other domestic purposes

COPING

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

- 38% of households reported adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water
  - Top 5 reported strategies
    - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one
    - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking
    - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water
    - Reduce drinking water consumption
    - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking

WATER SOURCE

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 53%
- Shallow tubewell: 26%
- Deep tubewell: 20%
- Protected spring: 1%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)
- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 72%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 13%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 11%
- VIP toilet: 3%
- Open hole: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

### Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 bin at household level</th>
<th>&gt; 1 bin at household level</th>
<th>Access to communal bin/pit</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin at household level (segregated)</th>
<th>Bin at household level (not segregated)</th>
<th>Throws waste in the open</th>
<th>Communal bin/pit (segregated)</th>
<th>Communal bin/pit (not segregated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 139; households with males, n = 138). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
**EDUCATION**

% of households with a education LSG: 49%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 7% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 42% Severe (severity score 3)
- 24% Stress (severity score 2)
- 22% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 5% Not classified

### PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

- 45% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak1

- 52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled2

- 25% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled3

### HOME-BASED LEARNING

- 47% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 20211

- 53% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning2

- 26% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning3

- 7% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning4

- 52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning2

- 40% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning3

#### Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

1. Marriage and/or pregnancy
2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
3. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
4. Household does not consider education important
5. Children too young to participate

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 100). Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 121; households with boys, n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

43% of households reported at least one school-aged child that **will not be sent back to learning facilities** once they will re-open

51% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that **will not be sent back**

21% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that **will not be sent back**

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting **main reasons for not sending them back** (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting **expecting challenges once children will be sent back**

Girls

- **Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility**: 12%
- **Marriage and/or pregnancy**: 4%
- **Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled**: 4%
- **Children are too old now**: 3%
- **Children are too young still**: 10%

Boys

- **Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility**: 17%
- **Children are too young still**: 4%
- **Lack of qualified teaching staff**: 4%
- **Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility**: 2%
- **Inaccessibility**: 2%

COPING

6% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for education**

EXPENDITURES

33% of households reported having incurred **education-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 100).
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 87 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 51 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 76 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 81 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 27%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 8% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 19% Severe (severity score 3)
- 11% Stress (severity score 2)
- 56% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 6% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.

- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.

- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

36% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection1

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- Education 26%
- Safe areas for playing 16%
- Safety and security 8%
- Food 7%
- Psychosocial support 4%
- Alternative care 4%
- Child protection case management/ social work support 4%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection1

Top 5 reported areas

- Women/girls
  - Education 11%
  - Safe areas for playing 8%
  - Safety and security 5%
  - Food 4%
  - Psychosocial support 4%
- Men/boys
  - Education 5%
  - Safe areas for playing 2%
  - Safety and security 2%
  - Food 2%
  - Psychosocial support 2%

of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months

1 Households could select multiple options.
### PROTECTION

#### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points-of-Contact</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting Where They Would or Would Not Send a Friend for Care and Support in Case of Assault or Abuse, by Point-of-Contact¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Households could select multiple options.

### PROTECTION NEEDS

- 66% of households reported needing protection services or support

#### Type of Support Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Needed</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 43% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 13%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:
- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 13% Severe (severity score 3)
- 7% Stress (severity score 2)
- 76% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 4% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION
- 10% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)
- 20% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- 42% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

Messaging
- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

Overall reach
- 93% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

Caregiver-led screening
- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- 76% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

Adolescent girls
- 16% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^{1}\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 92). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

\(^{2}\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 130).
HEALTH

% of households with a health LSG: 14%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Severe: 14% (severity score 3)
- Stress: 35% (severity score 2)
- None or minimal: 50% (severity score 1)
- Not classified: 1%

WELLBEING

60% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

86% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic: 68%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 27%
- Private clinic: 21%
- Government clinic: 5%
- Traditional/community healer: 2%

BARRIERS

48% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care:

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 25%
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 22%
  - Did not receive correct medications: 11%
  - Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility: 6%
  - Poor quality consultations at health facility: 5%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

72% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 72%
- 20 - 30 min: 25%
- > 30 min: 3%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (96%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (4%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 173). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

58% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 42%
- > 0 - 500: 55%
- > 500 - 1000: 2%
- > 1000 - 2000: 0%
- > 2000 - 5000: 1%

COPING

38% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 29% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.

- 28% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

- 29% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 19%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 12%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 7%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 3%
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 3%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 1%

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 94%
- No: 5%
- Don’t know/prefer not to answer: 1%

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (males): 12%
- Latrines (females): 11%
- Bathing facilities (females): 8%
- Bathing facilities (males): 7%
- Food assistance: 6%
- Health care: 6%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 3%
- Food assistance: 2%
- Latrines (males): 2%
- Bathing facilities (males): 2%
- Bathing facilities (females): 1%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Health care: 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 136). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 134). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 135). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 139; n, latrines (males) = 138; n, bathing facilities (females) = 139; n, bathing facilities (males) = 138; n, learning facilities (girls) = 83 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 46 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 140; n, food assistance = 141). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported problems

- Messages are not clear/understandable: 6%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 6%
- Aid workers do not share/discard: 3%
- Information isn’t shared often enough: 3%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 1%

92% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid</th>
<th>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid</th>
<th>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality</th>
<th>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both</th>
<th>Consulted but opinion not taken into account</th>
<th>Not consulted</th>
<th>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cyclones</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported challenges

- Don’t know how to read/write: 5%
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 3%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 3%
- The process was too complicated: 1%
- Language barriers: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 83%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 21%
- Severe (severity score 3): 62%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 16%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 86%
- Food security & livelihoods: 79%
- WASH: 58%
- Education: 47%
- Protection: 39%
- Nutrition: 14%
- Health: 8%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Shelter materials/upgrade: 69%
- Access to food: 50%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 38%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 32%
- Household/cooking items: 23%
- Access to education: 17%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 16%

Average household size: 5.2 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 14% Male: 86%
- Female: 14% Male: 86%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 1%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 3%
- After 24 August 2017: 96%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 18% Male: 82%

Total number of household interviews: 111
**SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)**

**% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:** 83%

**% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

**SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS**

84% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 81%
- Limited ventilation 25%
- Lack of insulation from cold 14%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 9%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 9%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 96%
- Damage to walls 15%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 14%

42% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

31% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin 38%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 19%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 19%
- Installed bracing 5%
- Repaired/upgraded the floor 3%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 73%
- No money to pay for materials 58%
- No money to pay for labour 7%
- Good quality materials are too expensive 4%
- No need to improve 15%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

- 59% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 62% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 93). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 56). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

### RENT PAYMENT

3% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 89%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 57%
- Shoes: 53%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 45%
- Kitchen sets: 41%
- Mosquito nets: 36%
- Blankets: 35%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 29%

### COOKING FUEL

99% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

58% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 62%
- Collected firewood: 32%
- Bought LPG refills: 11%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 4%

62+32+11+4+0% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

55% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 17%
- To repair or build shelter: 8%
- To access or pay for household items: 3%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 71%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 18% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 53% Severe (severity score 3)
- 25% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 4% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score¹:

- 14% Poor
- 48% Borderline
- 38% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

Of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection: 98%

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 2% None
- 2% > 0 - 500
- 5% > 500 - 1000
- 22% > 1000 - 2000
- 55% > 2000 - 5000
- 14% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

65% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection. Top 7 reported challenges:²

- 55% Food items do not last until next distribution
- 11% Long queues at distribution points
- 6% Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- 6% Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
- 5% Items received through distributions are of low quality
- 5% Lack of clarity on food entitlements
- 4% Items received through distributions are less preferred

LIVELIHOODS

72% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

¹ The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.
² Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

78% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection³.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection².

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; reducing non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.


**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: **53%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- **0%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **53%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **18%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **28%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **1%** Not classified

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- **100%** of households reported having **soap** at the time of data collection
- **40%** of households reported having spent **money on non-food household items** for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- **None**
- 60% > 0 - 500
- 34% > 500 - 1000
- 5% > 1000 - 2000
- 1% > 2000

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting **not having had enough water** for at least one purpose at the time of data collection: **26%**

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- **42%**

Top 5 reported strategies:

- **Fetch water at a source further than the usual one** 31%
- **Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking** 11%
- **Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water** 5%
- **Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking** 5%
- **Reduce drinking water consumption** 1%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**SANITATION FACILITIES**

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 43%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 32%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 22%
- VIP toilet: 3%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection:

- **Females:**
  - Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 43%
  - Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 21%
  - Latrines are difficult to reach: 16%
  - Lack of light inside latrines: 13%
  - Latrines are too far: 11%

- **Males:**
  - Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 43%
  - Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 21%
  - Latrines are difficult to reach: 16%
  - Lack of light inside latrines: 13%
  - Latrines are too far: 11%

**BATHING FACILITIES**

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection:

- **Females:**
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 27%
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 15%
  - Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 5%
  - Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
  - Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 2%

- **Males:**
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 22%
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 14%
  - Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 5%
  - Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
  - Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way/at facility: 2%

**WASTE MANAGEMENT**

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection:

- 1 bin at household level (segregated): 54%
- > 1 bin at household level: 36%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 17%
- None: 20%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated):

- Bin at household level (segregated): 42%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 58%
- Thrown waste in the open: 30%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 8%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 7%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 111; households with males, n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 45%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 25%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 19%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 27%
% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 23%

Girls
- 62% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 21% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 15% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 8% No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
- 6% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators

Boys
- 61% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 21% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 12% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 8% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 6% Lack of light in shelter

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

Girls
1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage and/or pregnancy
3. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
4. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
5. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators

Boys
1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage
3. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
4. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
5. Lack of light in shelter

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 48). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 97; households with boys, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

31% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

29% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

19% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)

Girls

- 43% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 32% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 15% Children are too old now
- 12% Household does not consider education important
- 9% Children are too young still

Boys

- 43% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 30% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 13% Children have fallen too far behind on learning
- 13% Lack of gender-segregated latrines at learning facility
- 6% Children are too old now

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back

Girls

- 11% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
- 5% Lack of gender segregation at learning facility
- 3% Children are too old now
- 3% Children have fallen too far behind on learning
- 3% Lack of gender-segregated latrines at learning facility

Boys

- 16% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
- 3% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 3% Children are too old now
- 2% No appropriate learning content provided for older children
- 2% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

COPING

11% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

30% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 48). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 47 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 65 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.

- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.

- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 37% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- % of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)
  - Education: 29%
  - Safe areas for playing: 15%
  - Food: 13%
  - Alternative care: 5%
  - Health care: 4%
  - Shelter: 3%
  - Psychosocial support: 3%

SAFETY & SECURITY

- % of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

  Women/girls
  - 13% of households reported the following areas to be unsafe:
    - On their way to different facilities: 10%
    - Markets: 7%
    - In transportation: 5%
    - Distribution sites: 3%
    - Latrines or bathing facilities: 2%

  Men/boys
  - 9% of households reported the following areas to be unsafe:
    - On their way to different facilities: 6%
    - Markets: 4%
    - In transportation: 3%
    - Social/community areas: 2%
    - In own shelter (at home): 1%

- 9% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
Households could select multiple options.

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

- Majhi: 86% (would send), 1% (would not send)
- Camps-in-Charge (CiCs): 77% (would send), 1% (would not send)
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 24% (would send), 4% (would not send)
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 23% (would send), 4% (would not send)
- Health facilities: 14% (would send), 0% (would not send)
- Law enforcement officials: 10% (would send), 5% (would not send)
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 10% (would send), 5% (would not send)
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 4% (would send), 4% (would not send)
- Legal aid service providers: 3% (would send), 3% (would not send)
- Psychosocial service providers: 3% (would send), 0% (would not send)
- None: 77% (would not send)
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 0% (would send), 7% (would not send)

Overall, 43% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 13%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

- 7% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- 16% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 31% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

MESSAGING

- 92% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 99% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

OVERALL REACH

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 81% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 73% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 20% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 110).
### HEALTH

**% of households with a health LSG:** 6%

*see Annex 1 for details on methodology*

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- 6% - Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% - Stress (severity score 2)
- 55% - None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% - Not classified

### WELLBEING

- **59%** of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

### HEALTH-SEEKERING BEHAVIOUR

- **90%** of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

### BARRIERS

- **46%** of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

#### Top 5 reported barriers

1. Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded - 28%
2. Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable - 23%
3. Did not receive correct medications - 13%
4. No functional health facility nearby - 6%
5. Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility - 5%

### ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

- **72%** of households reported travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation in 0 - < 20 min.
- **27%** in 20 - 30 min.
- **1%** in > 30 min.

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (99%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (1%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 108). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

33% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

![Graph showing % of households reporting total monthly expenditure by range (BDT)]

- 67% None
- 31% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000

**COPING**

25% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 47% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 40% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- 43% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 32% (adult women), 29% (adult men), 31% (children)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 17% (adult women), 15% (adult men), 20% (children)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 8% (adult women), 8% (adult men), 7% (children)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 5% (adult women), 4% (adult men), NA (children)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 3% (adult women), 2% (adult men), 5% (children)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 2% (adult women), 2% (adult men), 0% (children)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 1% (adult women), 0% (adult men), 0% (children)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

87% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives. 10% say no, 3% don’t know/prefer not to answer.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- Bathing facilities (females): 15%
- Bathing facilities (males): 12%
- Latrines (females): 9%
- Latrines (males): 8%
- Food assistance: 6%
- Health care: 6%

13% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- Latrines (males): 13%
- Latrines (females): 13%
- Bathing facilities (females): 2%
- Bathing facilities (males): 1%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%
- Health care: 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 111). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 111; n, latrines (males) = 110; n, bathing facilities (females) = 111; n, bathing facilities (males) = 110; n, learning facilities (girls) = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 46 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 111; n, food assistance = 111). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

70% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- **Non-food items**: 51%
- **Livelihoods**: 44%
- **Shelter**: 33%
- **Site management/development**: 32%
- **Remote education**: 28%
- **Protection services**: 23%
- **Health services**: 14%
- **Water**: 12%
- **Nutrition services**: 12%
- **Sanitation**: 8%
- **Food assistance**: 6%

13% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Aid workers do not share/disclose
- Messages are not clear/understandable
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask
- Information isn't shared often enough

13% of households reported facing challenges when accessing (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 8%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 2%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 2%
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 2%
- Information isn't shared often enough: 2%

97% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid**: 70%
- **Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality**: 8%
- **Consulted but opinion not taken into account**: 5%
- **Not consulted**: 8%

13% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 7%
- The process was too complicated: 4%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 4%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 3%
- Language barriers: 2%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 88%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 18%
- Severe (severity score 3): 69%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 12%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 77%
- Food security & livelihoods: 75%
- Education: 53%
- WASH: 51%
- Protection: 39%
- Nutrition: 10%
- Health: 7%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.66
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.21
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.87
4. Household/cooking items: 0.61
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.38
6. Access to clean drinking water: 0.37
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.24

POPULATION PROFILE
- Female (50%): 18%
- Male (50%): 82%

Average household size: 5.3 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 18%
- Male: 82%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 25%
- Male: 75%

Total number of household interviews: 114
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 75%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology.

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 75% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 11% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

80% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 74%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 24%
- Limited ventilation: 20%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 7%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 87%
- Damage to walls: 15%
- Materials don't insulate: 12%

29% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

30% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

61% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 46%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 24%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 17%
- Repaired the walls: 9%
- Installed bracing: 8%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 68%
- No money to pay for materials: 32%
- No money to pay for labour: 5%
- Good quality materials are too expensive: 2%
- No need to improve: 23%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 87% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation.
- 46% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves.

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 91). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 44). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 107).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

### SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

#### RENT PAYMENT

2% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

#### NON-FOOD ITEMS

**% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COOKING FUEL

94% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

53% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4)

- Bought firewood: 63%
- Bought LPG refills: 23%
- Collected firewood: 18%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 4%

61% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

44% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

#### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 2%
- To pay electricity bill or solar batteries: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 107).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 70%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 14% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 56% Severe (severity score 3)
- 26% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 4% Not classified

Food Consumption

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 8% Poor
- 48% Borderline
- 44% Acceptable

Food Assistance

57% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 47% Food items do not last until next distribution
- 12% Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- 8% Items received through distributions are of low quality
- 6% Long queues at distribution points
- 4% Items received through distributions are less preferred
- 4% Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
- 3% Cannot carry assistance to shelter

Food Expenditure

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- 29% > 0 - 500
- 4% > 500 - 1000
- 4% > 1000 - 2000
- 48% > 2000 - 5000
- 17% > 5000

Livelihoods

75% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)^1

- 5% Below SMEB
- 25% Between SMEB and MEB
- 70% Above MEB

• Including imputed amount of assistance
• Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection^2

To access or pay for food: 88%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
To access or pay for healthcare: 21%
To access or pay for education: 12%
To access or pay for household items: 8%
To access or pay for hygiene items: 4%
To repair or build shelter: 3%

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

• Adopted coping strategy
• Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

...stress coping strategies^3, 4 80%
...crisis coping strategies^3, 5 28%
...emergency coping strategies^3, 6 1%

^1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs for agriculture, fishing, business (spending).

^2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

^3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

^4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

^5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money or food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

^6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: **50%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (severity 4)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (severity 3)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (severity 2)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (severity 1)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- **98%** of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- **56%** of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**WATER SOURCE**

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4):

- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: **63%**
- Deep tubewell: **25%**
- Shallow tubewell: **11%**
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): **1%**

**WATER QUANTITIES**

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection: **31%**

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING**

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: **36%**
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: **12%**
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: **8%**
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: **7%**
- Spend money (or credit) that should be used otherwise on water: **1%**

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 54%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 24%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 19%
- VIP toilet: 3%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection\(^1\)

**Females**
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 25%
- Latrines are too far: 15%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 14%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 12%
- Latrines are difficult to reach: 11%

**Males**
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 28%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 13%
- Latrines are too far: 12%
- Latrines are difficult to reach: 11%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 10%

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection\(^1\)

**Females**
- Bathing facilities are too far: 10%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 7%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 4%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 3%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%

**Males**
- Bathing facilities are too far: 17%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 9%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 7%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 3%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 3%

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection\(^2\)

- 1 bin at household level: 59%
- > 1 bin at household level: 20%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 18%
- None: 9%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)\(^2\)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 44%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 28%
- Throws waste in the open: 25%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 7%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 8%

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, \(n = 113\); households with males, \(n = 112\)). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^2\) Households could select multiple options.
**EDUCATION**

% of households with a education LSG: 52%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 47% Severe (severity score 3)
- 38% Stress (severity score 2)
- 10% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**PRE-COVID ENROLMENT**

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak

- 50%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 47%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 38%

**HOME-BASED LEARNING**

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021

- 55%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 55%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 41%

**Girls**

- 69%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
3. Marriage and/or pregnancy
4. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
5. No home-based learning offered

**Boys**

- 63%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

1. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
3. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
4. Marriage
5. No home-based learning offered

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 103; households with boys, n = 91 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

- 51% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)
- 52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)
- 34% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

- % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^4\)
  - **Girls**:
    - 29% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
    - 21% Children are too old now
    - 18% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 12% Household does not consider education important
    - 12% Children are too young still
  - **Boys**:
    - 31% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
    - 34% Children are too old now
    - 29% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 29% Household does not consider education important
    - 25% Children are too young still

- % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^5\)
  - **Girls**:
    - 38% Marriage and/or pregnancy
    - 29% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 21% Children are too old now
    - 18% Household does not consider education important
    - 12% Children are too young still
  - **Boys**:
    - 31% Marriage
    - 25% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 21% Children are too old now
    - 18% Household does not consider education important
    - 15% Children are too young still

COPING

- 12% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^6\)

EXPENDITURES

- 25% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/− 11% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/− 13% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/− 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 72 - results are representative with a +/− 12% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 52 - results are representative with a +/− 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 62 - results are representative with a +/− 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 71 - results are representative with a +/− 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/− 11% margin of error.
**PROTECTION**

**% of households with a protection LSG:** 35%

**% of households per protection LSG severity score:**
- 7% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 28% Severe (severity score 3)
- 5% Stress (severity score 2)
- 48% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 11% Not classified

---

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

---

**CHILD NEEDS**

37% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

**% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)**

- Education: 25%
- Safe areas for playing: 18%
- Food: 11%
- Health care: 5%
- Shelter: 4%
- Alternative care: 4%
- Safety and security: 3%

---

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

**Women/girls**

- 18% On their way to different facilities
- 12% Markets
- 7% Distribution sites
- 3% Social/community areas
- 3% In own shelter (at home)

**Men/boys**

- 11% On their way to different facilities
- 9% Markets
- 5% In transportation
- 2% On the way to collect firewood
- 1% Social/community areas

6% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINTS-OF-CONTACT</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know / prefer not to answer

- Would send
- Would not send

Overall, 48% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
**NUTRITION**

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 9%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 9% Severe (severity score 3)
- 4% Stress (severity score 2)
- 87% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**CHILD NUTRITION**

- 9% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies** for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- 15% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition** by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 50% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition** since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**MESSAGING**

- 89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc.** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**OVERALL REACH**

- 95% of households with children aged 6-59 months **reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers** since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**

- 89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported **having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme** from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 80% of households reported **mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape** since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**

- 27% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported **at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets** since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

---

1. \(^{\text{The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13\% margin of error.}}\)
2. \(^{\text{The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 112).}}\)

---

The **mother-led MUAC programme** is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: 7%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- **7%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **32%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **61%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **1%** Not classified

**WELLBEING**

55% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

90% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- % of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:
  - NGO clinic 80%
  - Private clinic 26%
  - Pharmacy or drug shop in the market 18%
  - Traditional/ community healer 4%
  - Government clinic 1%

**BARRIERS**

51% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded 32%
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable 14%
  - Did not receive correct medications 14%
  - No functional health facility nearby 9%
  - Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility 6%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min 81%
- 20 - 30 min 18%
- > 30 min 2%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (100%) to the health facility.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 128). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- None: 71%
- > 0 - 500: 27%
- > 500 - 1000: 2%

**COPING**

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 95). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 32% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- 28% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- 27% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 23% (20%, 20%)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 20% (11%, 14%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 5% (2%, 4%)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 5% (5%, 4%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 4% (0%, 2%)
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 3% (2%, 1%)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 2% (4%, NA)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- 92% Yes
- 6% No
- 2% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 15%
- Latrines (males): 12%
- Health care: 11%
- Bathing facilities (females): 10%
- Bathing facilities (males): 7%
- Food assistance: 4%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (males): 11%
- Latrines (females): 11%
- Bathing facilities (females): 4%
- Bathing facilities (males): 3%
- Learning facilities (girls): 1%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Health care: 1%
- Food assistance: 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 111). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 111). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 113; n, latrines (males) = 112; n, bathing facilities (females) = 113; n, bathing facilities (males) = 112; n, learning facilities (girls) = 71 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 52 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, health care = 113; n, food assistance = 113). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES**

### ACCESSING INFORMATION

Of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of service / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Consultation</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted but opinion not taken into account</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consulted</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Challenge</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process was too complicated</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had fear about confidentiality</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know how to read/write</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/reaction received to feedback</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select up to 3 options.
2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 76%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 26%
- Severe (severity score 3): 50%
- Stress (severity score 2): 2%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 22%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 76%
- Food security & livelihoods: 76%
- WASH: 59%
- Education: 52%
- Protection: 41%
- Nutrition: 14%
- Health: 3%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Shelter materials/upgrade: 66%
- Access to food: 49%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 41%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 27%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 25%
- Household/cooking items: 22%
- Access to clean drinking water: 15%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.44
2. Access to food: 1.35
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.84
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.51
5. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.48
6. Household/cooking items: 0.38
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.22

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 5.5 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%): 24%
- Male (50%): 76%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 1%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 5%
- After 24 August 2017: 94%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 24%
- Male: 76%

Total number of household interviews: 116

Notes:
1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 88). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 71%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 0%
- Severe (severity score 3): 71%
- Stress (severity score 2): 8%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 21%
- Not classified: 1%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

- 71% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:
- Leaks during rain: 66%
- Limited ventilation: 22%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 16%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 9%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof: 93%
- Damage to/ unstable bamboo structure: 16%
- Damage to walls: 13%

34% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/ sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 68%
- No money to pay for materials: 29%
- No money to pay for labour: 5%
- No able-bodied household member available to make repairs: 2%
- No need to improve: 29%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...
- 93% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 47% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 56). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
of households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 115).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

Rent Payment

5% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Coping

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 28%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 6%
- To pay electricity bill for solar batteries: 3%
- To pay rent: 3%

Cooking Fuel

99% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

61% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought LPG refills: 41%
- Bought firewood: 33%
- Collected firewood: 20%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

53% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

48% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

Non-Food Items

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 115).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

71% of households with a food security LSG:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households per food security LSG severity score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (severity score 4)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (severity score 3)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12% Poor
37% Borderline
51% Acceptable

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 12% Poor
- 37% Borderline
- 51% Acceptable

99% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution
2. Items received through distributions are of low quality
3. Long queues at distribution points
4. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
5. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
6. Items received through distributions are less preferred
7. Harassment of women/girls at distribution sites

1% None
1% > 0 - 500
8% > 500 - 1000
17% > 1000 - 2000
57% > 2000 - 5000
16% > 5000

1% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

77% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- 6% below SMEB
- 18% between SMEB and MEB
- 78% above MEB

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.2

- To access or pay for food: 73%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 28%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 24%
- To access or pay for education: 12%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 6%
- To access or pay for hygiene items: 4%

Adopted coping strategy

- Coping strategy not available to household
- ExHAusted coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.3

Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/money; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and gifts, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); food items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/money; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 55%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 2%
- Severe (severity score 3): 53%
- Stress (severity score 2): 7%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 31%
- Not classified: 7%

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 96% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection.
- 53% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES

- 70% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
  - Extreme: 2%
  - Severe: 53%
  - Stress: 7%
  - None or minimal: 31%
  - Not classified: 7%

% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection:

- Cooking: 9%
- Drinking: 9%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 14%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 15%
- Other domestic purposes: 16%

COPING

- 39% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 30%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 10%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 3%
  - Reduce drinking water consumption: 3%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 2%

WATER SOURCE

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4):

- Deep tubewell: 36%
- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 34%
- Shallow tubewell: 21%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 8%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 74%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 14%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 11%
- Plastic bag and put in latrine after: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 37%
Males: 32%

Top 5 reported problems

1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 27%
2. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 20%
3. Latrines are not functioning: 17%
4. Latrines are too far: 10%
5. Latrines are difficult to reach: 5%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Females: 11%
Males: 6%

Top 5 reported problems

1. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 8%
2. Bathing facilities are too far: 3%
3. Bathing facilities are not functioning: 2%
4. Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 2%
5. Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 2%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 78%
- > 1 bin at household level: 11%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 26%
- None: 3%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 64%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 27%
- Throws waste in the open: 9%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 21%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 4%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 115; households with males, n = 112). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 49%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 5%
- Severe (severity score 3): 44%
- Stress (severity score 2): 28%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 16%
- Not classified: 7%

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

55% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.1

48% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.

36% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

61% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.1

53% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

50% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.1

Girls

- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 11%
- Marriage and/or pregnancy: 10%
- Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 6%
- Household does not consider education important: 6%
- No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children: 5%

Boys

- Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 11%
- Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 7%
- Lack of light in shelter: 7%
- No appropriate home-based learning content provided for older children: 6%
- Children too old to participate: 6%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 96; households with boys, n = 90 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
**SENDING BACK**

- 55% of households reported at least one school-aged child that **will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open**.
- 52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that **will not be sent back**.
- 36% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that **will not be sent back**.

**% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No appropriate learning content provided for older children</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back**:

- 7% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility.
- 7% Children are too old now.
- 5% Children are too young still.
- 4% No appropriate learning content provided for older children.
- 4% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children.
- 3% Lack of qualified teaching staff.
- 1% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled.

**COPING**

- 12% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for education**.

- 30% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.
**PROTECTION**

**% of households with a protection LSG:** 31%

**% of households per protection LSG severity score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

- Limitations related to *remote data collection*, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to *sensitive topics*.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, *sensitive issues may be under-reported*.
- *The reduced Protection Sector footprint* between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

19% of households reported perceiving that *needs of children in their community were not adequately met* to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- **Education**: 15%
- **Safe areas for playing**: 10%
- **Food**: 9%
- **Shelter**: 6%
- **Psychosocial support**: 3%
- **Health care**: 2%
- **Safety and security**: 1%

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting *areas considered unsafe* by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

- **Women/girls**: 21%
- **Men/boys**: 7%

Top 5 reported areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Women/girls (%)</th>
<th>Men/boys (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby forests/open spaces or farms</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8% of households reported the *safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated* compared to the previous 12 months

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 50% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 12%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- Extreme: 1% (severity score 4)
- Severe: 11% (severity score 3)
- Stress: 5% (severity score 2)
- None or minimal: 81% (severity score 1)
- Not classified: 2%

CHILD NUTRITION

- 14% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021).

- 18% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.

- 34% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan.

MESSAGING

- 93% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.

OVERALL REACH

- 99% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan.

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.

- 72% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan.

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 19% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan.

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 107).
% of households with a health LSG: 6%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- Severe (severity score 3): 6%
- Stress (severity score 2): 39%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 54%
- Not classified: 1%

WELLBEING

58% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

94% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

BARRIERS

36% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 22%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 17%
- No functional health facility nearby: 10%
- Did not receive correct medications: 9%
- Older persons face difficulties accessing health facility: 3%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 74%
- 20 - 30 min: 22%
- > 30 min: 4%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (99%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (1%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 108). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
### SITE MANAGEMENT

#### MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **38%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

- **33%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

- **42%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

#### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- **93%** of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.

#### ACCESSING SERVICES

- **Health care**: 10%
- **Latrines (females)**: 10%
- **Latrines (males)**: 9%
- **Food assistance**: 5%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 3%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 2%

- **93%** of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

#### Most commonly reported challenges

- **Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery**: 32%
- **Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep**: 18%
- **Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around**: 8%
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night**: 5%
- **Older persons face difficulties moving around camps**: 4%
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic**: 3%
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment**: 2%

- **Health care**: 10%
- **Latrines (females)**: 10%
- **Latrines (males)**: 9%
- **Food assistance**: 5%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 3%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 2%

- **93%** of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.

- **Latrines (females)**: 5%
- **Latrines (males)**: 4%
- **Food assistance**: 2%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 2%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 1%
- **Learning facilities (girls)**: 0%
- **Learning facilities (boys)**: 0%
- **Health care**: 0%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 114). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.

3. The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.

4. The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 115; n, latrines (males) = 112; n, bathing facilities (females) = 115; n, bathing facilities (males) = 112; n, learning facilities (girls) = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; n, learning facilities (boys) = 40 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error; n, health care = 115; n, food assistance = 116). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 54%
- Site management/development: 46%
- Livelihoods: 37%
- Remote education: 29%
- Shelter: 20%
- Protection services: 18%
- Nutrition services: 11%
- Health services: 10%
- Sanitation: 5%
- Water: 4%
- Food assistance: 1%

of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

15% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 8%
- No door to door information sharing: 4%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 3%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 3%
- Don't know where to get information/ who to ask: 3%

99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 66%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 9%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 7%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 13%
- Not consulted: 5%

66% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
9% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
7% Consulted but opinion not taken into account related to both
13% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
5% Not consulted

8% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 3%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 3%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 3%
- The process was too complicated: 2%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 92%  

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 16%
- Severe (severity score 3): 76%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 7%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 88%
- Food security & livelihoods: 82%
- WASH: 62%
- Education: 49%
- Protection: 31%
- Health: 11%
- Nutrition: 9%

**Priority Needs**

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):

- Shelter materials/upgrade: 70%
- Access to food: 65%
- Household/cooking items: 41%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 32%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 29%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 15%
- Access to education: 14%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:

1. Access to food: 1.70
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.58
3. Household/cooking items: 0.69
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.57
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.45
6. Access to education: 0.25
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.23

**Population Profile**

Average household size: 5.8 persons

Gender of head of household:

- Female: 9%
- Male: 91%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:

- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 8%
- After 24 August 2017: 92%

Gender of respondent:

- Female: 22%
- Male: 78%

Total number of household interviews: 113

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 104).
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 98).

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 87%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

87% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 83%
- Limited ventilation: 26%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 12%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 10%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:
- Damage to roof: 96%
- Damage to walls: 17%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 14%

41% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

35% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 39%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 21%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 21%
- Installed bracing: 9%
- Installed gutter: 4%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:
- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 80%
- No money to pay for materials: 53%
- No money to pay for labour: 11%
- Materials are unavailable: 4%
- No need to improve: 18%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

- 64% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 71% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 98).

3 Households could select multiple options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

RENT PAYMENT

0% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 100%
- Shoes: 73%
- Mosquito nets: 73%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 70%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 60%
- Blankets: 40%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 34%
- Kitchen sets: 32%

COOKING FUEL

97% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

45% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

56% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

51% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 7%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 2%
- To access or pay for household items: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 110).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
**FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS**

% of households with a food security LSG: 80%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 3% Not classified
- 18% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 70% Severe (severity score 3)
- 10% Extreme (severity score 4)

---

**FOOD CONSUMPTION**

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 4% Poor
- 56% Borderline
- 40% Acceptable

---

**FOOD EXPENDITURE**

- 98% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 2% None
- 3% > 0 - 500
- 7% > 500 - 1000
- 26% > 1000 - 2000
- 48% > 2000 - 5000
- 15% > 5000

---

**FOOD ASSISTANCE**

- 64% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution 57%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality 16%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred 6%
- Long queues at distribution points 6%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits 5%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport 4%
- Lack of space to safely store food in shelter 2%

---

**LIVELIHOODS**

- 67% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)1

- 80% Below SMEB
- 35% Between SMEB and MEB
- 59% Above MEB

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

To access or pay for food 93%
To access or pay for healthcare 33%
To access or pay for education 8%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 7%
To repair or build shelter 7%
To access or pay for cooking fuel 2%
To access or pay for household items 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy
- No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection3

- Borrowing money to buy food 52%
- Buying food on credit 48%
- Spending savings 18%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations 9%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance 5%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money 5%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures 5%
- Selling jewelry/gold 0%
- Selling household goods 15%
- Selling labour in advance 1%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport 27%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions 19%
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions 6%
- Entire household migrated 3%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs 3%
- Child marriage 1%
- Begging 100%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/-11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 61%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 59% Severe (severity score 3)
- 18% Stress (severity score 2)
- 21% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 95% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 46% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES
- 30% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:
- Drinking: 8%
- Cooking: 10%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 12%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 20%
- Other domestic purposes: 27%

HYGIENE ITEMS

WATER SOURCE
- 33% Deep tubewell
- 33% Shallow tubewell
- 32% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 2% Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)

COPING
- 41% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:
1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 37%
2. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 7%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 4%
4. Reduce drinking water consumption: 4%
5. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 4%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 59%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 20%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 17%
- VIP toilet: 4%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection1

- Females: 43%
- Males: 43%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection1

Females

- Bathing facilities are too far: 12%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 4%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 4%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 1%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 1%

Males

- Bathing facilities are too far: 7%
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 4%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 2%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 1%
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 2%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection2

- 1 bin at household level: 53%
- > 1 bin at household level: 24%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 19%
- None: 9%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)2

- Bin at household level (segregated): 50%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 22%
- Throws waste in the open: 15%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 18%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 1%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 113; households with males, n = 112). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 46%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>LSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stress (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None or minimal (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not classified (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

49% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

54% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.

21% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

50% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

55% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

23% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.

Girls

- 61% Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

Boys

- 52%

Girls

- 21% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 17% Children too old to participate
- 10% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 10% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 7% Children too young to participate

Boys

- 14% Children too old to participate
- 12% Marriage
- 11% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 9% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 5% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 105; households with boys, n = 94 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

- **52%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open\(^1\)
- **58%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back\(^2\)
- **24%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back\(^3\)

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>No appropriate learning content provided for older children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>Lack of qualified teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>Children have fallen too far behind on learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning facilities overcrowded</td>
<td>Poor learning facility infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

- **8%** of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education\(^6\)

EXPENDITURES

- **35%** of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection

---

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 78 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^5\) The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 74 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^6\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 28%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 23% Severe (severity score 3)
- 16% Stress (severity score 2)
- 54% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

32% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- Education 25%
- Safe areas for playing 13%
- Food 10%
- Safety and security 4%
- Health care 4%
- Shelter 2%
- Psychosocial support 1%

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

- **Women/girls**
  - 12% on their way to different facilities
  - Top 5 reported areas
    - 1 Markets
    - 2 Distribution sites
    - 3 Markets
    - 4 Latrines or bathing facilities
    - 5 Social/community areas
- **Men/boys**
  - 12% on their way to different facilities
    - 1 Markets
    - 2 On their way to different facilities
    - 3 In transportation
    - 4 Latrines or bathing facilities
    - 5 Social/community areas

13% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
**POINTS-OF-CONTACT**

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 42% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 8%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

13% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.1

3% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021).1

46% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan.1

MESSAGING

90% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.1

OVERALL REACH

100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan.1

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

80% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan.1

80% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan.1

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

32% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan.2

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 111).
% of households with a health LSG: 10%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 10% Severe (severity score 3)
- 40% Stress (severity score 2)
- 50% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

WELLBEING

63% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

92% of household members reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- 75% at NGO clinic
- 30% at Private clinic
- 17% at Pharmacy or drug shop in the market
- 4% at Government clinic
- 1% at Traditional/ community healer

BARRIERS

54% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Top 5 reported barriers:
  - Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 27%
  - Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 26%
  - Did not receive correct medications: 18%
  - No functional health facility nearby: 10%
  - Health services are too far away/lack of transport: 4%

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

73% of households reported travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation.

- 73% 0 - < 20 min
- 22% 20 - 30 min
- 4% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (98%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (2%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 153). Households could select multiple options.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

38% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

- None: 62%
- > 0 - 500: 38%

**COPING**

33% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 86). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **32%** of households with adult women reported that **adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- **30%** of households with adult men reported that **adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.
- **33%** of households with children reported that **children in their household faced challenges moving around camps** at the time of data collection.

Most commonly reported challenges:
- **Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery**: 22%, 22%, 24%
- **Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep**: 16%, 13%, 17%
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night**: 5%, 5%, 3%
- **Older persons face difficulties moving around camps**: 4%, 2%, NA
- **Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around**: 2%, 1%, 0%
- **Distances have become longer due to fencing**: 2%, 2%, 1%
- **It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic**: 0%, 0%, 1%

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:
- **89%** Yes
- **10%** No
- **1%** Don’t know / prefer not to answer

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting **services being too far** as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- **Health care**: 13%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 12%
- **Latrines (females)**: 11%
- **Latrines (males)**: 10%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 7%
- **Food assistance**: 4%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting **inaccessibility** as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- **Latrines (females)**: 13%
- **Latrines (males)**: 11%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 4%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 2%
- **Food assistance**: 1%
- **Learning facilities (girls)**: 0%
- **Learning facilities (boys)**: 0%
- **Health care**: 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 113). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 111). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 113; n, latrines (males) = 112; n, bathing facilities (females) = 113; n, bathing facilities (males) = 112; n, learning facilities (girls) = 77 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, health care = 112; n, food assistance = 113). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.

---
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COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 72% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 12% of households reported facing problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

1. Aid workers do not share/disclose
2. Messages are not clear/understandable
3. The information shared is irrelevant/no new information is shared
4. Information isn't shared often enough
5. Don't know where to get information/who to ask

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 96% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

1. Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback
2. No female staff collecting/receiving feedback
3. The process was too complicated
4. Had fear about confidentiality
5. No possibility to give feedback at shelter/could not leave the house

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 89%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 26%
- Severe (severity score 3): 63%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 11%
- Not classified: 0%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Food security & livelihoods: 78%
- WASH: 67%
- Shelter & non-food items: 61%
- Education: 50%
- Protection: 33%
- Nutrition: 12%
- Health: 11%

Priority Needs

- % of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
  - Access to food: 59%
  - Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 47%
  - Shelter materials/upgrade: 43%
  - Access to self-reliance activities: 40%
  - Household/cooking items: 21%
  - Access to clean drinking water: 20%
  - Access to education: 13%

Average household size: 5.1 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%): 13%
- Male (50%): 87%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 5%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 94%
- After 24 August 2017: 1%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 17%
- Male: 83%

Total number of household interviews: 133

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 118).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 59%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 58% Severe (severity score 3)
- 13% Stress (severity score 2)
- 26% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 3% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

59% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 50%
- Limited ventilation 26%
- Lack of insulation from cold 8%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 4%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof 88%
- Damage to windows and/or doors 19%
- Materials trap heat 10%

23% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

36% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs3:

- Replaced tarpaulin 43%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 24%
- Tied down the roof/shelter 23%
- Installed bracing 7%
- Repaired/upgraded the windows and/or doors 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs4:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 44%
- No money to pay for materials 22%
- No money to pay for labour 6%
- Materials are unavailable 5%
- No need to improve 50%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 87% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 55% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 78). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3 Households could select multiple options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 64). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 67). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 83). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 132).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 83). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 132).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 13% Poor
- 52% Borderline
- 35% Acceptable

% of households with a food security LSG: 76%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 20% Extreme
- 56% Severe
- 22% No/minimal / stress
- 2% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 13% Poor
- 52% Borderline
- 35% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 21%
- 50%
- 19%
- 0%

FOOD ASSISTANCE

38% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:
- Food items do not last until next distribution: 28%
- Long queues at distribution points: 10%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 9%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 7%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 5%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 5%
- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site: 5%

LIVELIHOODS

68% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

- To access or pay for food: 78%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 27%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To access or pay for education: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 5%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

- ...stress coping strategies3, 4: 58%
- ...crisis coping strategies3, 5: 22%
- ...emergency coping strategies3, 6: 1%

1 In line with REVA4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); education-related expenditures (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 83). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 65%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 5%
- Severe (severity score 3): 60%
- Stress (severity score 2): 14%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 18%
- Not classified: 3%

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 96% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection.
- 63% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

WATER QUANTITIES
- 32% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

HYGIENE ITEMS
- % of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
  - None: 37%
  - > 0 - 500: 47%
  - > 500 - 1000: 8%
  - > 1000 - 2000: 5%
  - > 2000 - 5000: 3%

WATER SOURCE
- % of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4):
  - Shallow tubewell: 47%
  - Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 28%
  - Deep tubewell: 23%
  - Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 2%

COPING
- 49% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water.

- Top 5 reported strategies:
  - Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 38%
  - Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 14%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 6%
  - Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 5%
  - Reduce drinking water consumption: 4%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush or pour/flush toilet</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with a slab and platform</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without a slab or platform</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of light inside latrines</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females feel unsafe using bathing facilities, because they are not (appropriately) gender-segregated</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bin at household level</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 bin at household level</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (segregated)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (not segregated)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throws waste in the open</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (segregated)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (not segregated)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 131; households with males, n = 133). Households could select up to 5 options.
² Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 47%

% of households per education LSG severity score:
- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 44% Severe (severity score 3)
- 26% Stress (severity score 2)
- 21% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 6% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT
- 36% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled:
- 37%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled:
- 24%

HOME-BASED LEARNING
- 45% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning:
- 39%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning:
- 37%

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:
- Girls: 36%, Boys: 43%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons:
1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage and/or pregnancy
3. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
4. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
5. Children cannot concentrate at home

Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: Girls 18%, Boys 13%
Marriage and/or pregnancy: Girls 11%, Boys 8%
Lack of guidance from learning facilitators: Girls 8%, Boys 8%
Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: Girls 7%, Boys 7%
Children cannot concentrate at home: Girls 4%, Boys 5%
Marriage: Girls 5%

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 112; households with boys, n = 89). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

38% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.1

35% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.2

25% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.3

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):4

Girls Boys
1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled 14% 20%
2. Marriage 6% 3%
3. Household does not consider education important 5% 3%
4. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility 5% 1%
5. Children are too young still 7% 10%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:5

Girls Boys
1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility 14% 20%
2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled 6% 3%
3. Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility 5% 3%
4. Households does not consider education important 5% 3%
5. Children are too old now 5% 1%

COPING

12% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.6

EXPENDITURES

26% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 81 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 49 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 74 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 83). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 31%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 28% Severe (severity score 3)
- 15% Stress (severity score 2)
- 45% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 9% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

35% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Need</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

Women/boys

12% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 reported areas</th>
<th>Women/boys</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the way to collect firewood</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 44% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.
**NUTRITION**

% of households with a nutrition LSG: **12%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 12% Severe (severity score 3)
- 5% Stress (severity score 2)
- 83% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

**CHILD NUTRITION**

- 3% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 17% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 26% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

**MESSAGING**

- 92% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**OVERALL REACH**

- 100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

**CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING**

- 91% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

**ADOLESCENT GIRLS**

- 79% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

- 12% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 92). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 127).
% of households with a health LSG: 11%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 11% Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% Stress (severity score 2)
- 50% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 1% Not classified

**WELLBEING**

49% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

82% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 74%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 29%
- Private clinic: 16%
- Government clinic: 5%
- Traditional/community healer: 1%

**BARRIERS**

44% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care:

- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 22%
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 22%
- No functional health facility nearby: 12%
- Did not receive correct medications: 6%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way: 5%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 68%
- 20 - 30 min: 32%
- > 30 min: 1%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (95%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (5%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 146). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

40% of households reported having incurred *health-related expenditures* in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 60%
- > 0 - 500: 39%
- > 500 - 1000: 2%

**COPING**

27% of households reportedly having adopted *livelihoods-based coping strategies* in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to *access or pay for health care*.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 83). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
**SITE MANAGEMENT**

**MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS**

- of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection: 22%
- of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection: 18%
- of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection: 21%

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION**

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 92%
- No: 6%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 2%

**ACCESSING SERVICES**

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Bathing facilities (females): 15%
- Health care: 14%
- Latrines (females): 8%
- Latrines (males): 7%
- Food assistance: 5%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (males): 5%
- Latrines (females): 5%
- Bathing facilities (females): 2%
- Health care: 1%
- Bathing facilities (males): 1%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 131). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 131). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 120). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 131; n, latrines (males) = 133; n, bathing facilities (females) = 131; n, bathing facilities (males) = 133; n, learning facilities (girls) = 73 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 43 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 132; n, food assistance = 132). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- **80%** of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- % of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:
  - Non-food items: 67%
  - Livelihoods: 46%
  - Site management/development: 35%
  - Remote education: 33%
  - Shelter: 26%
  - Protection services: 23%
  - Nutrition services: 17%
  - Health services: 15%
  - Sanitation: 9%
  - Water: 8%
  - Food assistance: 2%

- **28%** of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

  - Top 5 reported problems:
    - Aid workers do not share/disclose: 8%
    - No door to door information sharing: 6%
    - Messages are not clear/understandable: 5%
    - The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 5%
    - Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 2%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- % of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 65%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 5%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 8%
  - Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 14%
  - Not consulted: 3%
  - Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 5%

- **65%** of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

  - Top 5 reported challenges:
    - No response/reaction received to feedback: 5%
    - Mistreated when providing feedback: 4%
    - Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 3%
    - The process was too complicated: 3%
    - Don’t know how to read/write: 3%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 83%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>MSNI Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 78%
- Food security & livelihoods: 68%
- WASH: 51%
- Education: 46%
- Protection: 39%
- Nutrition: 8%
- Health: 7%

POPULATION PROFILE

Female (50%): Age 60+ 1%, 25-59 16%, 18-24 7%, 12-17 6%, 5-11 12%, 0-4 6%
Male (50%): Age 60+ 1%, 25-59 16%, 18-24 7%, 12-17 6%, 5-11 12%, 0-4 6%

Average household size: 4.7 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 87%
- Male: 13%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 87%
- Male: 13%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 3%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 97%
- After 24 August 2017: 3%

Total number of household interviews: 119

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 99).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 76%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 1%
- Severe (severity score 3): 76%
- Stress (severity score 2): 7%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 15%
- Not classified: 2%

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

75% of households reported at least one shelter issue.

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 71%
- Limited ventilation: 24%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 13%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 9%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 1%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 94%
- Damage to walls: 18%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 15%

46% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues.

20% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection.

31% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 22%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 13%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 8%
- Installed bracing: 6%
- Repaired the walls: 3%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 67%
- No money to pay for materials: 50%
- No money to pay for labour: 10%
- Materials are unavailable: 9%
- No need to improve: 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

73% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation.

62% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves.

Footnotes:
1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 88). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 37). Results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error.
### RENT PAYMENT

12% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 92%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 69%
- Shoes: 66%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 39%
- Kitchen sets: 37%
- Mosquito nets: 36%
- Blankets: 30%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 30%

### COOKING FUEL

97% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

52% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 47%
- Collected firewood: 41%
- Bought LPG refills: 24%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 7%

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 5%
- To repair or build shelter: 2%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%

---

<sup>1</sup> Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

<sup>2</sup> The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

<sup>3</sup> The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 115).

<sup>4</sup> The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

Households with a food security LSG:

66%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

14% Extremes (severity score 4)
51% Severe (severity score 3)
30% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
4% Not classified

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

13% Poor
40% Borderline
47% Acceptable

FOOD ASSISTANCE

of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

41%

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution (34%)
- Long queues at distribution points (8%)
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport (6%)
- Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site (5%)
- Items received through distributions are of low quality (3%)
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits (3%)
- Older persons face challenges accessing at distribution sites (3%)

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 0%
- > 0 - 500: 3%
- > 500 - 1000: 8%
- > 1000 - 2000: 23%
- > 2000 - 5000: 49%
- > 5000: 18%

LIVELIHOODS

74% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- 71% of households reported having exhausted or adopted cop-ing strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.2

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...

... stress coping strategies3, 4

... crisis coping strategies3, 5

... emergency coping strategies3, 6

---

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 50%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:
- 3% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 47% Severe (severity score 3)
- 18% Stress (severity score 2)
- 33% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS
- 98% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 48% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES
% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING
% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fetch water at a source further than the usual one</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce drinking water consumption</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
### WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

#### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 45%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 25%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 24%
- VIP toilet: 6%

#### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- **Females**:
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 13%
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 13%
  - Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 5%
  - Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 4%
  - Bathing facilities are not functioning: 3%

- **Males**:
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 13%
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 9%
  - Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic: 6%
  - Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 3%
  - Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 3%

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 55%
- > 1 bin at household level: 34%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 11%
- None: 5%

### Top 5 reported problems

1. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded
2. Bathing facilities are too far
3. Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic
4. Bathing facilities are difficult to reach
5. Lack of light inside bathing facilities

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 119; households with males, n = 115). Households could select up to 5 options.

2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 45%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 43% Severe (severity score 3)
- 25% Stress (severity score 2)
- 24% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 7% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 28%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 22%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning: 35%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning: 26%

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

- 52% Girls
  - 14% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 14% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - 9% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
  - 8% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 7% Children cannot concentrate at home
- 55% Boys
  - 12% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - 12% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
  - 9% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
  - 7% Children cannot concentrate at home
  - 7% Marriage

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 102; households with boys, n = 82 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
SENDING BACK

35% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

33% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

19% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

31% % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

Girls Top 5 reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boys Top 5 reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lack of gender segregation at learning facility</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lack of structured schooling</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

6% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

32% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 47). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 69 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 38 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 34%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 32% Severe (severity score 3)
- 6% Stress (severity score 2)
- 50% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 10% Not classified

Limitations
- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

43% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)

- Education: 24%
- Safe areas for playing: 18%
- Safety and security: 16%
- Health care: 10%
- Food: 7%
- Alternative care: 4%
- Psychosocial support: 3%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/girls

- 21% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months

Men/boys

- 19% of households reported the safety and security situation in their area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months

Top 5 reported areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women/girls</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- **Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)**: 77% send, 2% would not send
- **Majhi**: 64% send, 3% would not send
- **Ombudsman/national human rights institutions**: 20% send, 3% would not send
- **Health facilities**: 19% send, 0% would not send
- **Law enforcement officials**: 18% send, 6% would not send
- **Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms**: 18% send, 3% would not send
- **Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives**: 13% send, 8% would not send
- **Legal aid service providers**: 8% send, 1% would not send
- **Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres**: 4% send, 3% would not send
- **Psychosocial service providers**: 3% send, 3% would not send
- **None**: 0% send, 66% would not send
- **Don’t know / prefer not to answer**: 9% send, 0% would not send

Overall, 47% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 9%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 9% Severe (severity score 3)
- 2% Stress (severity score 2)
- 89% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 7% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 18% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 45% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 95% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 82% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 78% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 17% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 117).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: **8%**

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- **8%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **44%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **48%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **0%** Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

58% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

91% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.  

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: **80%**
- Private clinic: **26%**
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: **16%**
- Government clinic: **5%**
- Traditional/ community healer: **4%**

---

**BARRIERS**

45% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.  

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: **26%**
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: **13%**
- No functional health facility nearby: **10%**
- Did not receive correct medications: **9%**
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility: **4%**

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- **66%** 0 - < 20 min
- **32%** 20 - 30 min
- **3%** > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (94%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (6%).

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 133). Households could select multiple options.
2. Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

41% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 59% of households reported total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
  - None
  - > 0 - 500
  - > 500 - 1000
  - > 1000 - 2000

**COPING**

28% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
## SITE MANAGEMENT

### MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **37%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- **30%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.
- **41%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection. Households could select up to 5 options.

#### Most commonly reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances have become longer due to fencing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- **91%** of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.
- **8%** Yes, No, Don’t know / prefer not to answer, Don’t have community representative.

### ACCESSING SERVICES

- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 13%
- **Health care**: 12%
- **Latrines (males)**: 10%
- **Latrines (females)**: 9%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 9%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 9%
- **Food assistance**: 6%

- **Latrines (females)**: 11%
- **Latrines (males)**: 10%
- **Bathing facilities (males)**: 3%
- **Bathing facilities (females)**: 3%
- **Food assistance**: 1%
- **Health care**: 1%
- **Learning facilities (girls)**: 0%
- **Learning facilities (boys)**: 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 119). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 110). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 119; n, latrines (males) = 115; n, bathing facilities (females) = 119; n, bathing facilities (males) = 115; n, learning facilities (girls) = 64 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; n, learning facilities (boys) = 36 - results are representative with a +/- 17% margin of error; n, health care = 119; n, food assistance = 119). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 58%
- Remote education: 36%
- Livelihoods: 35%
- Shelter: 34%
- Site management/development: 28%
- Protection services: 24%
- Health services: 14%
- Nutrition services: 13%
- Water: 6%
- Sanitation: 4%
- Food assistance: 3%

of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection:

Top 5 reported problems:
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 11%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 4%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 4%
- No door to door information sharing: 3%
- Information isn't shared often enough: 2%

of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection:

92%

of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection:

100%

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

66%
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account
- Not consulted
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer

of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

Top 5 reported challenges:
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 7%
- Language barriers: 5%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 4%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 3%
- The process was too complicated: 2%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
MULTI-SECTORAL NEEDS & DEMOGRAPHICS

% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 94%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 10%
- Severe (severity score 3): 83%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 6%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 75%
- Food security & livelihoods: 62%
- Education: 49%
- WASH: 37%
- Protection: 18%
- Health: 9%
- Nutrition: 9%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 80%
- Access to food: 57%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 34%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 28%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 21%
- Household/cooking items: 21%
- Access to clean drinking water: 13%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.76
2. Access to food: 1.53
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.58
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.53
5. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.39
6. Household/cooking items: 0.30
7. Access to clean drinking water: 0.23

POPULATION PROFILE

Average household size: 5.7 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 8%
- Male: 92%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 16%
- Male: 84%

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 0%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 2%
- After 24 August 2017: 98%

Total number of household interviews: 109

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 102).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
5 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

Households could select multiple options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 30). Results are representative with a +/- 18% margin of error.

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

72% of households reported at least one shelter issue1

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain 71%  
- Limited ventilation 18%  
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 10%  
- Lack of insulation from cold 10%  
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues2,3

- Damage to roof 96%  
- Materials trap heat 18%  
- Damage to shelter due to unsafe location 8%

50% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

23% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:

72%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

LSG

0% Extreme (severity score 4)  
72% Severe (severity score 3)  
10% Stress (severity score 2)  
17% None or minimal (severity score 1)  
0% Not classified

28% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs3

- Replaced tarpaulin 20%  
- Tied down the roof/shelter 10%  
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure 6%  
- Installed bracing 5%  
- Repaired the walls 3%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs4

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 52%  
- No money to pay for materials 46%  
- No money to pay for labour 6%  
- Materials are unavailable 3%  
- No need to improve 33%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...3,5

57% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation

80% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 Households could select multiple options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 30). Results are representative with a +/- 18% margin of error.
RENT PAYMENT

6% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 86%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 61%
- Shoes: 60%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 35%
- Kitchen sets: 29%
- Blankets: 24%
- Mosquito nets: 22%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 20%

COOKING FUEL

88% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

46% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 63%
- Collected firewood: 34%
- Bought LPG refills: 14%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

51% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

49% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 12%
- To access or pay for household items: 5%
- To repair or build shelter: 3%
- To pay rent: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 96).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 5% Poor
- 36% Borderline
- 60% Acceptable

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 7% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 52% Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 2% Not classified

FOOD ASSISTANCE
- 40% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection
- Top 7 reported challenges:
  - Food items do not last until next distribution: 39%
  - Items received through distributions are of low quality: 6%
  - Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 5%
  - Long queues at distribution points: 4%
  - Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 4%
  - Items received through distributions are less preferred: 1%
  - Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 1%

FOOD EXPENDITURE
- 96% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection
- % of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
  - None: 4%
  - > 0 - 500: 0%
  - > 500 - 1000: 3%
  - > 1000 - 2000: 19%
  - > 2000 - 5000: 50%
  - > 5000: 25%

LIVELIHOODS
- 70% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket). 1

- 3% Below SMEB
- 26% Between SMEB and MEB
- 77% Above MEB

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection 2

- To access or pay for food 96%
- To access or pay for healthcare 31%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes 12%
- To access or pay for education 11%
- To access or pay for household items 5%
- To repair or build shelter 3%
- To access or pay for agricultural inputs 1%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted... 3, 4

- Stress coping strategies
- Crisis coping strategies
- Emergency coping strategies

Exhausted coping strategy
No need to adopt coping strategy

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### % of households with a WASH LSG:

38%

(see Annex 1 for details on methodology)

### % of households per WASH LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HYGIENE ITEMS

- 99% of households reported having **soap** at the time of data collection.
- 52% of households reported having **spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items)** in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### WATER QUANTITIES

- 32% of households reporting not having **enough water** for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

#### % of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COPING

- 39% of households reporting **adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water**

#### Top 5 reported strategies

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one (23%)
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking (16%)
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water (8%)
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking (8%)
5. Mix safe and unsafe water for drinking (2%)

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 59%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 28%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 13%
- Hanging toilet/latrine: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection:

- Females: 30%
- Males: 30%

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection:

- Females: 17%
- Males: 16%

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection:

- 1 bin at household level: 76%
- > 1 bin at household level: 11%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 28%
- None: 1%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated):

- Bin at household level (regulated): 69%
- Bin at household level (not regulated): 17%
- Throws waste in the open: 6%
- Communal bin/pit (regulated): 16%
- Communal bin/pit (not regulated): 8%

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 109; households with males, n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: **49%**

**see Annex 1 for details on methodology**

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled **46%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled **20%**

HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning **56%**

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning **27%**

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 reported challenges/ reasons

1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage and/or pregnancy
3. Household does not consider education important
4. Lack of light in shelter
5. Children cannot concentrate at home

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 97; households with boys, n = 89 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

43% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

46% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

17% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):

Girls

Boys

37% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled

Children are too old now 33%

30% Children are too old now

Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled 31%

21% Marriage and/or pregnancy

Marriage 18%

17% Household does not consider education important

Household does not consider education important 11%

8% Children are too young still

Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility 9%

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:

Girls

Boys

4% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility

Children are too old now 3%

4% Children are too old now

No appropriate learning content provided for older children 3%

2% No appropriate learning content provided for older children

2% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

2% Household does not consider education important

Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility 2%

Top 5 reported challenges

COPING

11% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

26% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 45 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 54 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 66 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 17%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

36% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
Households could select multiple options.

**POINTS-OF-CONTACT**

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 44% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

**PROTECTION NEEDS**

35% of households reported needing protection services or support

- Improved safety and security in general: 19%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 15%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 11%
- Access to justice and mediation: 6%

1 Households could select multiple options.
NUTRITION

% of households with a nutrition LSG: 8%
see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (1)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

- 10% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- 15% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 59% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 89% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 72% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

MESSAGING

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

OVERALL REACH

- 100% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 25% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 108).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:** 8%

*see Annex 1 for details on methodology*

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WELLBEING**

50% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

86% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- NGO clinic: 68%
- Private clinic: 32%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 21%
- Government clinic: 11%
- Traditional/community healer: 1%

**BARRIERS**

40% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 25%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 15%
- Did not receive correct medications: 15%
- No functional health facility nearby: 8%
- Poor quality consultations at health facility: 6%

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 80%
- 20 - 30 min: 20%
- > 30 min: 0%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (99%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (1%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 98). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
### HEALTH

#### EXPENDITURES

36% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 64% reported total monthly expenditure below 500 BDT
- 31% reported total monthly expenditure between 500 and 1000 BDT
- 2% reported total monthly expenditure between 1000 and 2000 BDT
- 3% reported total monthly expenditure above 2000 BDT

#### COPING

31% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 75). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 15% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- 12% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- 16% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

1. Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 13% (9% adult women; 14% adult men; 16% children)
2. Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 6% (5% adult women; 7% adult men; 9% children)
3. It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 2% (1% adult women; 1% adult men; 2% children)
4. Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1% (0% adult women; 0% adult men; 0% children)
5. Cannot access facilities anymore due to fencing: 1% (1% adult women; NA adult men; 0% children)
6. Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 0% (2% adult women; 0% adult men; 0% children)
7. It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 0% (0% adult women; 0% adult men; 2% children)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- 87% Yes
- 9% No
- 4% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Health care: 9%
- Latrines (females): 9%
- Latrines (males): 7%
- Bathing facilities (males): 6%
- Bathing facilities (females): 6%
- Food assistance: 1%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 6%
- Latrines (males): 5%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Food assistance: 0%
- Health care: 0%
- Bathing facilities (males): 0%
- Bathing facilities (females): 0%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 104). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 109; n, latrines (males) = 108; n, bathing facilities (females) = 109; n, bathing facilities (males) = 108; n, learning facilities (girls) = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 36 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 109; n, food assistance = 109). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
Communitwith Communities

Accessing Information

62% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

- Non-food items: 55%
- Livelihoods: 30%
- Shelter: 30%
- Remote education: 28%
- Site management/development: 28%
- Protection services: 17%
- Water: 13%
- Nutrition services: 13%
- Health services: 10%
- Sanitation: 8%
- Food assistance: 4%

9% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 6%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 1%
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 1%
- Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information: 1%

Communities reported 62% of households not able to access information.

Community Engagement

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:

71% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
6% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
6% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
8% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
8% Not consulted

1% of households reported facing challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 1%
- The process was too complicated: 1%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 1%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 1%
- Older persons face challenges providing feedback: 1%
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 90%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (Score 4)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (Score 3)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (Score 2)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or Minimal (Score 1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Classified</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:

- Shelter & non-food items: 73%
- Food security & livelihoods: 61%
- Education: 59%
- WASH: 50%
- Protection: 35%
- Nutrition: 10%
- Health: 4%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.82
2. Access to food: 1.73
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.93
4. Household/cooking items: 0.41
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.37
6. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.31
7. Access to health services and/or medicine: 0.11

Average household size: 5.3 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 18%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 77%
- After 24 August 2017: 5%

Total number of household interviews: 104

---

1. Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4. This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5. Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6. Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 71%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

73% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 67%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 24%
- Limited ventilation: 21%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 4%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 3%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 93%
- Materials don’t insulate: 18%
- Materials trap heat: 16%

44% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 70%
- No money to pay for materials: 33%
- No money to pay for labour: 5%
- Good quality materials are too expensive: 3%
- No need to improve: 29%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

76% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation

37% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

1 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

2 Households could select multiple options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 38). Results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 101).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

### RENT PAYMENT

28% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COOKING FUEL

97% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

51% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bought firewood</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought LPG refills</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected firewood</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54% of households reported incurring expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

52% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter-NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To pay rent: 8%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%
- To pay electricity bill for solar batteries: 3%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 101).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households by Food Consumption Score:
- 15% Poor
- 26% Borderline
- 59% Acceptable

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- 1% None
- 2% > 0 - 500
- 9% > 500 - 1000
- 21% > 1000 - 2000
- 58% > 2000 - 5000
- 9% > 5000

Top 7 reported challenges:
- Food items do not last until next distribution: 38%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 11%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 8%
- Long queues at distribution points: 8%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 4%
- Cannot carry assistance to shelter: 2%
- Harassment of women/girls at distribution sites: 1%

% of households with a food security LSG: 60%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:
- 17% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 42% Severe (severity score 3)
- 40% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 0% Not classified

% of households reporting had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection: 86%
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)1

- 68% of households below SMEB
- 2% of households below SMEB
- 19% of households between SMEB and MEB
- 78% of households above MEB

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

- To access or pay for food: 94%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 30%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 23%
- To access or pay for education: 8%
- To pay rent: 8%
- To access or pay for household items: 8%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection3

- Stress coping strategies: 8% 4
- Crisis coping strategies: 12% 5
- Emergency coping strategies: 1% 6

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: **50%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4) 3%
- Severe (severity score 3) 47%
- Stress (severity score 2) 7%
- None or minimal (severity score 1) 41%
- Not classified 2%

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 99% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 58% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

**WATER QUANTITIES**

- % of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection: **15%**

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Drilling: 9%
- Cooking: 11%
- Other domestic purposes: 12%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 12%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 12%

**WATER SOURCE**

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4):

- Deep tubewell: 40%
- Shallow tubewell: 29%
- Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 26%
- Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 5%

Top 4 reported strategies:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 14%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 7%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 3%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 3%

---

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flush or pour/flush toilet</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine with a slab and platform</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine without a slab or platform</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open hole</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP toilet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are not functioning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

Top 5 reported problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 bin at household level</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communal bin/pit</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Method</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (segregated)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin at household level (not segregated)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throws waste in the open</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (segregated)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal bin/pit (not segregated)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 103; households with males, n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 55%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 9%
- Severe (severity score 3): 46%
- Stress (severity score 2): 30%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 13%
- Not classified: 2%

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

59% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- Girls: 52%
- Boys: 54%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled: 52%

% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled: 54%

HOME-BASED LEARNING

63% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

- Girls: 58%
- Boys: 59%

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons:

Girls:

1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage and/or pregnancy
3. Children cannot concentrate at home
4. Lack of light in shelter
5. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children

Boys:

1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage
3. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children
4. Lack of light in shelter
5. Children cannot concentrate at home

LEGEND

LSG see Annex 1 for details on methodology

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 85 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 85 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

57% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.1

51% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.2

52% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.3

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5):4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children are too old now</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Children are too young still</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back:5

Girls Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Inaccessibility</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children have fallen too far behind on learning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Household is unaware of education opportunities available or how to access them</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Household is unaware of education opportunities available or how to access them</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

8% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education:6

EXPENDITURES

17% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 79). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 53 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 55 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 33%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 10% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 23% Severe (severity score 3)
- 3% Stress (severity score 2)
- 58% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 7% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.

- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.

- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 23% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Need</th>
<th>% of Households Unmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

Women/girls

- 13% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In own shelter (at home)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men/boys

- 8% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines or bathing facilities</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households could select multiple options.
Households could select multiple options.

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

- **Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)**: 86% would send, 1% would not send
- **Majhi**: 72% would send, 1% would not send
- **Law enforcement officials**: 33% would send, 6% would not send
- **Ombudsman/national human rights institutions**: 31% would send, 2% would not send
- **Health facilities**: 20% would send, 9% would not send
- **Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres**: 9% would send, 12% would not send
- **Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms**: 7% would send, 1% would not send
- **Legal aid service providers**: 6% would send, 3% would not send
- **Psychosocial service providers**: 4% would send, 2% would not send
- **Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives**: 4% would send, 7% would not send
- **None**: 0% would send, 68% would not send
- **Don’t know / prefer not to answer**: 0% would send, 12% would not send

Overall, **59% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact**, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.
# NUTRITION

## % of households with a nutrition LSG:
- 9%

### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>88%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHILD NUTRITION

- **5%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- **15%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- **47%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

## CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- **93%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

## MESSAGING

- **95%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

## OVERALL REACH

- **100%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

## ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- **29%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

---

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 101).
**HEALTH**

**% of households with a health LSG:**

4%

*see Annex 1 for details on methodology*

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- 4% Severe (severity score 3)
- 25% Stress (severity score 2)
- 71% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

48% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

96% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic

- NGO clinic 77%
- Private clinic 48%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market 15%
- Government clinic 9%
- Traditional/community healer 2%

---

**BARRIERS**

24% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded 15%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable 13%
- Did not receive correct medications 12%
- No functional health facility nearby 8%
- Health services are too far away/lack of transport 3%

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 0 - < 20 min 81%
  - 20 - 30 min 15%
  - > 30 min 4%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (90%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (7%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 114). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

35% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

- 65% reported no expenditure.
- 34% reported expenditure ranging from 0 to 500 BDT.
- 0% reported expenditure ranging from 501 to 1000 BDT.
- 1% reported expenditure ranging from 1001 to 2000 BDT.

**COPING**

30% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 71). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- Of households with adult women, 16% reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- Of households with adult men, 16% reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- Of households with children, 14% reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Adult women</th>
<th>Adult men</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 92% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.
- 6% of households report no response.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 9% of households report health care as a barrier.
- 8% of households report latrines (males) as a barrier.
- 7% of households report latrines (females) as a barrier.
- 5% of households report bathing facilities (females) as a barrier.
- 4% of households report food assistance as a barrier.
- 3% of households report bathing facilities (males) as a barrier.
- 2% of households report learning facilities (girls) as a barrier.
- 2% of households report bathing facilities (males) as a barrier.
- 2% of households report learning facilities (boys) as a barrier.
- 0% of households report food assistance as a barrier.
- 0% of households report health care as a barrier.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 93). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 99). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 103; n, latrines (males) = 103; n, bathing facilities (females) = 103; n, bathing facilities (males) = 103; n, learning facilities (girls) = 51 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 47 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 104; n, food assistance = 104). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**ACCESSING INFORMATION**

67% of households reported **not having been able to access** (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- % of households reporting **not having been able to access** (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:
  - Non-food items: 40%
  - Livelihoods: 33%
  - Site management/development: 27%
  - Remote education: 22%
  - Shelter: 21%
  - Protection services: 12%
  - Health services: 9%
  - Sanitation: 6%
  - Nutrition services: 5%
  - Water: 3%
  - Food assistance: 2%

5% of households reported having **faced problems** when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 5 reported problems:
  - Aid workers do not share/disclose: 2%
  - No door to door information sharing: 2%
  - Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%
  - Information isn't shared often enough: 1%
  - Older persons face difficulties receiving/understanding information: 1%

95% of households reported having been **able to access** (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been **able to access** (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

% of households reporting **having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household's opinion into account** related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 70%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 10%
  - Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 7%
  - Not consulted: 8%

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 3%

- Don't know / prefer not to answer: 3%

6% of households reported having **faced challenges** when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- Top 5 reported challenges:
  - Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 5%
  - No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
  - Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 2%
  - The process was too complicated: 1%
  - Mistreated when providing feedback: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 89%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 22%
- Severe (severity score 3): 67%
- Stress (severity score 2): 2%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 10%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 87%
- Food security & livelihoods: 70%
- WASH: 48%
- Education: 43%
- Protection: 31%
- Nutrition: 16%
- Health: 8%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.47
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.24
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.96
4. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.52
5. Household/cooking items: 0.46
6. Access to clean drinking water: 0.44
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.31

Average household size: 5.5 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

Gender of respondent:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 24%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 5%
- After 24 August 2017: 71%

Total number of household interviews: 105

---

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 93). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
### SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

#### % of households with a shelter & NFI LSG:

82%  
*see Annex 1 for details on methodology*

#### % of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>82%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>Not classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>(severity score 4)</td>
<td>(severity score 3)</td>
<td>(severity score 2)</td>
<td>(severity score 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

### SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

65% of households reported at least one **shelter issue**

- **Most commonly reported issues**
  - Leaks during rain: 59%
  - Limited ventilation: 30%
  - Lack of insulation from cold: 17%
  - Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
  - Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 3%

% of households reporting **reasons for shelter issues** (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 91%
- Materials trap heat: 24%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 12%

24% of households reported **not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues**

26% of households reported having incurred **expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair** in the 3 months prior to data collection

#### of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 37%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 15%
- Installed bracing: 9%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 7%
- Installed gutter: 4%

% of households reporting **main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter** (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 48%
- No money to pay for materials: 30%
- No money to pay for labour: 7%
- Good quality materials are too expensive: 2%
- No need to improve: 50%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 67% reported having **received shelter materials** from a humanitarian organisation
- 53% reported having **purchased shelter materials** themselves

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 68). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 54). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 51). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
## Rent Payment

50% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

## Non-Food Items

### % of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cooking Fuel

100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

46% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

### % of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4)

- Bought firewood: 58%
- Bought LPG refills: 30%
- Collected firewood: 16%
- Kerosene or other combustible: 2%

## Coping

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 20%
- To pay rent: 17%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 5%
- To access or pay for household items: 5%
- To repair or build shelter: 4%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Food Consumption Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOD ASSISTANCE

48% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 44%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 13%
- Long queues at distribution points: 9%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 8%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 5%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 4%
- Lack of clarity on food entitlements: 1%

LIVELIHOODS

77% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.2

To access or pay for food 93%
To access or pay for healthcare 49%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 20%
To pay rent 17%
To access or pay for education 12%
To access or pay for hygiene items 7%
To access or pay for cooking fuel 5%

• Adopted coping strategy
• Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.3

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/ money

Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions
Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions
Entire household migrated
Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs
Child marriage
Begging

• ExHAUSTED coping strategy
• No need to adopt coping strategy

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance).

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 50%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 49% Severe (severity score 3)
- 20% Stress (severity score 2)
- 30% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 97% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 55% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER SOURCE

- 85% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 9% Shallow tubewell
- 4% Deep tubewell
- 1% Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)

% of households reporting main source of water used for drinking at the time of data collection (top 4)

WATER QUANTITIES

- 32% % of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Drinking 12%
- Cooking 14%
- Other domestic purposes 26%
- Personal hygiene at shelter 27%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location 28%

COPING

- 41% % of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:

- Fetch water at a source further than the usual one 24%
- Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking 17%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking 10%
- Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water 7%
- Spend money (or credit) that should be used otherwise on water 4%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 104; households with males, n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.

### Sanitation Facilities

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- **Flush or pour/flush toilet**: 64%
- **Pit latrine with a slab and platform**: 19%
- **Pit latrine without a slab or platform**: 15%
- **VIP toilet**: 2%

### Bathing Facilities

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- **Females**:
  - 23% Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded
  - 17% Bathing facilities are too far
  - 4% Bathing facilities are not functioning
  - 3% Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic
  - 1% Lack of light inside bathing facilities

- **Males**:
  - 15% Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded
  - 7% Bathing facilities are too far
  - 4% Bathing facilities are not functioning
  - 3% Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic
  - 1% Persons with disabilities have problems accessing/using bathing facilities

### Waste Management

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level
- > 1 bin at household level
- Access to communal bin/pit
- None

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 46%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 28%
- Throws waste in the open: 20%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 13%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 3%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 104; households with males, n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 41%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-COVID Enrolment

- 54% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.
- 43% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.
- 37% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

Home-Based Learning

- 59% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.
- 50% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.
- 42% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

Challenges/Reasons for Home-Based Learning

- Top 5 reported challenges/reasons for girls:
  1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (26%)
  2. Marriage and/or pregnancy (13%)
  3. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children (12%)
  4. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning (9%)
  5. Household does not consider education important (8%)

- Top 5 reported challenges/reasons for boys:
  1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (18%)
  2. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for younger children (11%)
  3. Marriage (8%)
  4. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning (7%)
  5. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators (7%)

Notes:
1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 93 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error; households with boys, n = 83 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
**EDUCATION**

### SENDING BACK

- **52%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that **will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open**.

- **46%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

- **35%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

- **% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)**:
  - **Girls**
    - 39% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 27% Marriage and/or pregnancy
    - 25% Children are too old now
    - 10% Household does not consider education important
    - 5% No appropriate learning content provided for older children
  - **Boys**
    - 43% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 23% Children are too old now
    - 16% Marriage
    - 11% Household does not consider education important
    - 9% Children are too young still

- **% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back**:
  - **Girls**
    - 10% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
    - 5% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children
    - 3% No appropriate learning content provided for older children
    - 2% Learning facilities overcrowded
    - 2% Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - **Boys**
    - 7% Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility
    - 3% Children have fallen too far behind on learning
    - 2% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
    - 2% No appropriate learning content provided for older children
    - 2% No appropriate learning content provided for younger children

### COPING

- **12%** of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for education**.

### EXPENDITURES

- **31%** of households reported having incurred **education-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 85). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
3. The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 44 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 61 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 28%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 9%
- Severe (severity score 3): 19%
- Stress (severity score 2): 8%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 56%
- Not classified: 9%

Limitations:

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

29% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection. The % of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Education: 19%
- Safe areas for playing: 18%
- Food: 10%
- Safety and security: 2%
- Psychosocial support: 2%
- Health care: 2%
- Alternative care: 1%

SAFETY & SECURITY

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Women/girls:
  - Top 5 reported areas:
    - Markets: 6%
    - Distribution sites: 4%
    - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 3%
    - Latrines or bathing facilities: 1%
    - In transportation: 1%

- Men/boys:
  - Top 5 reported areas:
    - Markets: 2%
    - Nearby forests/open spaces or farms: 2%
    - Latrines or bathing facilities: 1%
    - Friend's/relative's home: 1%
    - On their way to different facilities: 1%

5% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know / prefer not to answer

• Would send
• Would not send

### PROTECTION NEEDS

45% of households reported needing protection services or support:

- Improved safety and security in general: 30%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 15%
- Access to justice and mediation: 10%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 9%

Overall, 36% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 14%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme
- 14% Severe
- 3% Stress
- 83% None or minimal
- 0% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 14% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)

- 25% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 37% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 84% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

- 75% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

MESSAGING

- 86% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

OVERALL REACH

- 96% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 23% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 57). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 102).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: **7%**  

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- **7%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **30%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **62%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **1%** Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

58% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

92% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection **sought treatment at a clinic**.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by **treatment location**:

- NGO clinic: 55%
- Private clinic: 44%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 28%
- Government clinic: 13%

---

**BARRIERS**

51% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing **barriers when needing to access health care**.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 34%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 28%
- Did not receive correct medications: 25%
- Poor quality consultations at health facility: 6%
- No functional health facility nearby: 3%

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting **travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility** by their normal mode of transportation:

- 0 - < 20 min: 78%
- 20 - 30 min: 22%
- > 30 min: 0%

Most commonly households reported that they would be **walking** (96%) to the health facility, followed by using **tuk tuks** (3%).

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 104). Households could select multiple options.
2. Households could select up to 3 options.
of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 - 500</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500 - 1000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 - 2000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 76). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- **28%** of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.

- **22%** of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

- **25%** of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

Most commonly reported challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Adult women</th>
<th>Adult men</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances have become longer due to fencing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- % of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

  - Yes: 94%
  - No: 5%
  - Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

ACCESSING SERVICES

- % of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

  - Latrines (females): 7%
  - Latrines (males): 6%
  - Bathing facilities (females): 7%
  - Bathing facilities (males): 6%
  - Food assistance: 5%
  - Health care: 5%

- % of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

  - Learning facilities (boys): 2%
  - Health care: 1%
  - Learning facilities (girls): 0%
  - Food assistance: 0%
  - Latrines (males): 0%
  - Latrines (females): 0%
  - Bathing facilities (males): 0%
  - Bathing facilities (females): 0%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 102). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 104; n, latrines (males) = 102; n, bathing facilities (females) = 104; n, bathing facilities (males) = 102; n, learning facilities (girls) = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 40 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 104; n, food assistance = 105). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
**COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES**

### ACCESSING INFORMATION

- **75%** of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **12%** of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

  - **10%** Aid workers do not share/disclose
  - **1%** Don’t know where to get information/who to ask

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- **81%** of households reported having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

  - **5%** Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
  - **4%** Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
  - **4%** Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
  - **7%** Consulted but opinion not taken into account
  - **8%** Not consulted

- **0%** of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

---

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 87%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 23%
- Severe (severity score 3): 64%
- Stress (severity score 2): 0%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 13%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 95%
- Food security & livelihoods: 89%
- WASH: 41%
- Education: 36%
- Protection: 35%
- Nutrition: 23%
- Health: 16%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Access to food: 61%
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 53%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 46%
- Household/cooking items: 35%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 26%
- Access to clean drinking water: 16%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 11%

Average household size: 5.7 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

% of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:
- Before October 2016: 3%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 9%
- After 24 August 2017: 88%

Total number of household interviews: 108

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 94). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: **95%**

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 95% Severe (severity score 3)
- 2% Stress (severity score 2)
- 3% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

- 76% of households reported at least one shelter issue

  Most commonly reported issues:
  - Leaks during rain 75%
  - Limited ventilation 24%
  - Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) 15%
  - Lack of insulation from cold 15%
  - Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there 2%

- 40% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

- 24% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations 67%
- No money to pay for materials 49%
- Materials are unavailable 10%
- No money to pay for labour 6%
- No need to improve 32%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 64% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 53% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves
Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 108).

The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

Rent Payment

87% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Non-food Items

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 96%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 77%
- Shoes: 66%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 58%
- Mosquito nets: 56%
- Kitchen sets: 48%
- Blankets: 43%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 40%

COoking Fuel

100% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

57% of households reported having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reported not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 59%
- Collected firewood: 28%
- Bought LPG refills: 17%

55% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

38% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Coping

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To pay rent: 15%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 5%

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 108).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
**FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS**

% of households with a food security LSG: **83%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- **20%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **63%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **14%** No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- **3%** Not classified

### FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- **16%** Poor
- **48%** Borderline
- **36%** Acceptable

### FOOD EXPENDITURE

of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

- **97%**

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- **3%** None
- **2%** > 0 - 500
- **5%** > 500 - 1000
- **22%** > 1000 - 2000
- **48%** > 2000 - 5000
- **20%** > 5000

### FOOD ASSISTANCE

51% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

- **40%** Food items do not last until next distribution
- **15%** Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
- **10%** Items received through distributions are of low quality
- **6%** Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
- **6%** Long queues at distribution points
- **4%** Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site
- **3%** Items received through distributions are less preferred

### LIVELIHOODS

of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

- **79%**

---

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
### MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Households</th>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Excluding imputed amount of assistance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Including imputed amount of assistance</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

### LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 6) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- **To access or pay for food**: 96%
- **To access or pay for healthcare**: 33%
- **To pay rent**: 15%
- **To access or pay for education**: 11%
- **To access or pay for clothes, shoes**: 5%
- **To access or pay for hygiene items**: 1%

Of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection.

- **Borrowing money to buy food**: 47% (53%)
- **Buying food on credit**: 43% (57%)
- **Spending savings**: 24% (60%)
- **Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations**: 19% (81%)
- **Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance**: 15% (85%)
- **Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money**: 10% (90%)
- **Reducing essential non-food expenditures**: 3% (96%)
- **Selling jewelry/gold**: 1% (20%) (67%)
- **Selling household goods**: 1% (20%) (79%)
- **Selling labour in advance**: 1% (20%) (100%)
- **Selling productive assets or means of transport**: 1% (20%) (65%)
- **Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions**: 1% (20%) (99%)
- **Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions**: 1% (20%) (100%)
- **Entire household migrated**: 1% (20%) (100%)
- **Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs**: 1% (20%) (100%)
- **Child marriage**: 1% (20%) (100%)
- **Beggimg**: 100%

- **Adopted coping strategy**: 63%
- **Coping strategy not available to household**: 32%
- **Exhausted coping strategy**: 1%

Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money; selling labor in advance.

Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high risk; illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items spending and value of assistance; non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) spending and value of assistance; fuel spending and value of assistance; transportation spending and value of assistance; shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, light bulbs, etc.) spending; health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 73). Results are representative with +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labor in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

% of households with a WASH LSG: **40%**

- **% of households per WASH LSG severity score:**
  - Extreme (severity score 4): 4%
  - Severe (severity score 3): 36%
  - Stress (severity score 2): 26%
  - None or minimal (severity score 1): 34%
  - Not classified: 0%

**HYGIENE ITEMS**

- 92% of households reported **having had soap** at the time of data collection.
- 61% of households reported having **spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items)** in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**WATER QUANTITIES**

- 34% of households reporting **not having had enough water** for at least one purpose at the time of data collection.

### % of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WATER SOURCE**

- 85% of households reporting **main source of water used for drinking** at the time of data collection (top 4)
  - Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site: 85%
  - Deep tubewell: 7%
  - Shallow tubewell: 5%
  - Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown): 2%

**COVING**

- 56% of households reporting **adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water**

### Top 5 reported strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fetch water at a source further than the usual one</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce drinking water consumption</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 5)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 67%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 24%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 5%
- VIP toilet: 4%
- Bucket toilet and put in latrine after: 1%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- Females: 37%
- Males: 35%

Top 5 reported problems

1. Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding
2. Latrines are unclean/unhygienic
3. Latrines are not functioning
4. Latrines are too far
5. Lack of light inside latrines

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- Females: 33%
- Males: 26%

Top 5 reported problems

1. Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded
2. Bathing facilities are too far
3. Bathing facilities are not functioning
4. Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic
5. Bathing facilities are difficult to reach

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 43%
- > 1 bin at household level: 18%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 16%
- None: 25%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level ( segregated): 37%
- Bin at household level ( not segregated): 13%
- Throws waste in the open: 32%
- Communal bin/pit ( segregated): 12%
- Communal bin/pit ( not segregated): 4%

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 108; households with males, n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options.
2 Households could select multiple options.
EDUCATION

% of households with a education LSG: 35%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 34% Severe (severity score 3)
- 36% Stress (severity score 2)
- 23% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 6% Not classified

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

- 39% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak¹
- 43% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled²
- 22% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled³

HOME-BASED LEARNING

- 40% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021¹
- 43% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning²
- 25% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning³

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefiting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning¹

Girls
- 51% Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

Boys

1. Marriage and/or pregnancy 15%
2. Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning 10%
3. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled 8%
4. Marriage 8%
5. Lack of light in shelter 8%
6. Children too old to participate 7%
7. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators 8%
8. Children too old to participate 7%

¹The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
²The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
³The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
⁴The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 95 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.; households with boys, n = 89 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

42% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

48% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

20% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Children are too old now</td>
<td>Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marriage and/or pregnancy</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
<td>Household does not consider education important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Children are too young still</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21% % of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back.

Girls

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (12%)  
2. Poor learning facility infrastructure (8%)  
3. Household does not consider education important (7%)  
4. Lack of gender segregation at learning facility (7%)  
5. Poor learning facility infrastructure (7%)

Boys

1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (12%)  
2. Lack of qualified teaching staff (9%)  
3. Learning facilities overcrowded (7%)  
4. Household does not consider education important (5%)  
5. Poor learning facility infrastructure (5%)

COPING

11% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

43% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 84). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 65). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 42 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 75 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: 31%

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 1% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 31% Severe (severity score 3)
- 12% Stress (severity score 2)
- 47% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 9% Not classified

Limitations

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

CHILD NEEDS

- 41% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe areas for playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY & SECURITY

- 14% % of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 reported areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women/girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby forests/open spaces or farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their way to different facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own shelter (at home)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
## PROTECTION

### POINTS-OF-CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points-of-Contact</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (CiCs)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Households could select multiple options.*

### PROTECTION NEEDS

- % of households reporting *where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Needed</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- % of households reported *needing protection services or support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support Needed</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security in general</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved safety and security for women and girls</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health &amp; psychosocial support</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to justice and mediation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, **34% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact**, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 20%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or Minimal (1)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD NUTRITION

- 6% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)
- 35% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan
- 27% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 79% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan
- 71% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

MESSAGING

- 95% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 98% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 23% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 105).
**HEALTH**

% of households with a health LSG: 15%

% of households per health LSG severity score:
- 15% Severe (severity score 3)
- 35% Stress (severity score 2)
- 50% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

---

**WELLBEING**

67% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

86% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.  

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:
- NGO clinic: 69%
- Private clinic: 40%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market: 30%
- Government clinic: 4%

---

**BARRIERS**

55% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.  

Top 5 reported barriers:
- Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded: 39%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable: 35%
- Did not receive correct medications: 17%
- No functional health facility nearby: 6%
- Poor quality consultations at health facility: 5%

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
- 0 - < 20 min: 69%
- 20 - 30 min: 30%
- > 30 min: 2%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (94%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (6%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 154). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
**HEALTH**

**EXPENDITURES**

56% of households reported having incurred **health-related expenditures** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 44% None
- 52% > 0 - 500
- 2% > 500 - 1000
- 2% > 1000 - 2000

**COPING**

33% of households reportedly having **adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies** in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to **access or pay for health care**.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 33% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^1\)
- 33% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^2\)
- 34% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^3\)

Most commonly reported challenges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances have become longer due to fencing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons face difficulties moving around camps</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 104). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 98). Households could select up to 5 options.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 94% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 15% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (females)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (males)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (females)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (males)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 6% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (males)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines (females)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (females)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning facilities (girls)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities (males)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning facilities (boys)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 108; n, latrines (males) = 106; n, bathing facilities (females) = 108; n, bathing facilities (males) = 106; n, learning facilities (girls) = 59 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 41 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 106; n, food assistance = 108). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

69% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services/assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

The top 5 reported problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection:

- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 11%
- No door to door information sharing: 7%
- The information shared is irrelevant, no new information is shared: 6%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 4%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 2%

24% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

71% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

15% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 70%
- Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 8%
- Not consulted: 7%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality

- Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 11%

Consulted but opinion not taken into account related to both

- Consulted but opinion not taken into account related to both: 2%

Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback

- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 8%

The process was too complicated

- The process was too complicated: 2%

Language barriers

- Language barriers: 1%

Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely

- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 7%

*Households were asked separately about each type of service.

1 Households could select up to 3 options.

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 87%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- 65% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 22% Severe (severity score 3)
- 1% Stress (severity score 2)
- 0% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 12% Not classified

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 88%
- Food security & livelihoods: 79%
- Education: 44%
- WASH: 38%
- Protection: 35%
- Health: 12%
- Nutrition: 12%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Access to food: 1.65
2. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.31
3. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.69
4. Access to clean drinking water: 0.43
5. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.40
6. Household/cooking items: 0.35
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.26

Average household size: 5.4 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 26%
- Male: 74%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 24%
- Male: 76%

Total number of household interviews: 108
% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 87%

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 87% Severe (severity score 3)
- 6% Stress (severity score 2)
- 7% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

81% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain: 77%
- Limited ventilation: 23%
- Lack of insulation from cold: 9%
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 5%
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 4%

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof: 97%
- Damage to windows and/or doors: 16%
- Materials trap heat: 14%

43% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 35%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 16%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 13%
- Installed bracing: 8%
- Repaired/upgraded the floor: 4%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 73%
- No money to pay for materials: 50%
- Materials are unavailable: 10%
- No money to pay for labour: 5%
- No need to improve: 26%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...

- 57% reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 74% reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1. Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
2. The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
3. Households could select multiple options.
4. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 62). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
5. The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 46). Results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.
**RENT PAYMENT**

54% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

**NON-FOOD ITEMS**

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

- Fans: 96%
- Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 70%
- Shoes: 64%
- Mosquito nets: 48%
- Clothing and winter clothing: 46%
- Kitchen sets: 39%
- Blankets: 35%
- Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 29%

**COOKING FUEL**

97% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

46% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution. 

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 45%
- Bought LPG refills: 28%
- Collected firewood: 25%
- Shelter materials used as firewood: 2%

50% of households reported having incurred expenditures for non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) in the 3 months prior to data collection.

44% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**COPING**

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 21%
- To pay rent: 14%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for cooking fuel: 1%
- To access or pay for household items: 1%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 105).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a composite score based on (1) dietary diversity; (2) food frequency; and (3) relative nutritional importance of nine weighted food groups. The FCS is recorded from a seven-day recall period. In Bangladesh, thresholds for FCS classifications set by WFP are as follows: > 42 = Acceptable; > 28 - 42 = Borderline; ≤ 28 = Poor.

Households could select up to 5 options.

% of households with a food security LSG: 72%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 19%
- Severe (severity score 3): 53%
- No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2): 24%
- Not classified: 4%

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- Poor: 12%
- Borderline: 42%
- Acceptable: 46%

FOOD EXPENDITURE

100% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 0%
- > 0 - 500: 5%
- > 500 - 1000: 11%
- > 1000 - 2000: 21%
- > 2000 - 5000: 49%
- > 5000: 14%

FOOD ASSISTANCE

57% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 52%
- Long queues at distribution points: 7%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 6%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 6%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits: 4%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 3%
- Lack of clarity on food entitlements: 2%

LIVELIHOODS

69% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below SMEB</th>
<th>Between SMEB and MEB</th>
<th>Above MEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Including imputed amount of assistance
• Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

- To access or pay for food: 90%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 31%
- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 21%
- To pay rent: 14%
- To repair or build shelter: 12%
- To access or pay for education: 6%
- To pay for ceremonies: 1%

• Adopted coping strategy
• Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection3

- Borrowing money to buy food: 45%
- Buying food on credit: 45%
- Spending savings: 45%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 26%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 19%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/ money: 16%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 11%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 3%
- Selling household goods: 2%
- Selling labour in advance: 1%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 1%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 1%
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 1%
- Entire household migrated: 1%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 1%
- Child marriage: 1%
- Begging: 1%

• Adopted coping strategy
• Exhausted coping strategy
• No need to adopt coping strategy

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted...4

- ...stress coping strategies: 69%
- ...crisis coping strategies: 28%
- ...emergency coping strategies: 2%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).
2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.
4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.
5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/food; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.
6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 39%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 39% Severe (severity score 3)
- 34% Stress (severity score 2)
- 27% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 98% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 46% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

- 44% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at bathing location</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other domestic purposes</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hygiene at shelter</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water:

- 63% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one (49%)
2. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking (16%)
3. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking (13%)
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water (8%)
5. Reduce drinking water consumption (2%)

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
**WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)**

### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 59%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 25%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 12%
- VIP toilet: 4%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

- **Females**
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 27%
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 18%
  - Bathing facilities are not functioning: 10%
  - Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 5%
  - Others: 3%

- **Males**
  - Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 22%
  - Bathing facilities are too far: 16%
  - Bathing facilities are not functioning: 5%
  - Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 4%
  - Others: 1%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 56%
- > 1 bin at household level: 27%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 12%
- None: 6%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 49%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 26%
- Throws waste in the open: 19%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 11%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 1%

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with female individuals reporting problems females in their household face, and households with male individuals reporting problems males in their household face (households with females, n = 107; households with males, n = 107). Households could select up to 5 options.

2. Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a education LSG: 44%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- 4% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 40% Severe (severity score 3)
- 39% Stress (severity score 2)
- 16% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

51% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Girls

45% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having been enrolled.

Boys

50% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

51% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

Girls

47% % of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

Boys

32% % of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards not benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning.

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

1. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
2. Marriage and/or pregnancy
3. Household does not consider education important
4. Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
5. No appropriate home-based learning content provided for older children

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
### EDUCATION

#### SENDING BACK

51% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

- **Girls**: 51%
- **Boys**: 24%

#### Top 5 reported challenges

- **Girls**:
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (11%)
  2. Learning facilities overcrowded (5%)
  3. Lack of qualified teaching staff (5%)
  4. Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled (4%)
  5. Children have fallen too far behind on learning (4%)

- **Boys**:
  1. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility (10%)
  2. Learning facilities overcrowded (6%)
  3. Lack of qualified teaching staff (6%)
  4. Children have fallen too far behind on learning (4%)
  5. Children are too young still (3%)

#### COPING

6% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

#### EXPENDITURES

26% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 73). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 58). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 60). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 60 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 48 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 56 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 68 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: **33%**

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- **6%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **27%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **14%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **44%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **9%** Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection

**Women/girls**

1. Latrines or bathing facilities
2. Social/community areas
3. On their way to different facilities
4. Distribution sites
5. Water points

**Men/boys**

1. Social/community areas
2. Markets
3. On their way to different facilities
4. Latrines or bathing facilities
5. In transportation

19% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
**POINTS-OF-CONTACT**

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Would send</th>
<th>Would not send</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majhi</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps-in-Charge (C/Cs)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement officials</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman/national human rights institutions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/relatives/guardians, curators, or legal authorized representatives</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid service providers</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial service providers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting type of support needed:

- Improved safety and security in general: 53%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 21%
- Access to justice and mediation: 17%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 16%

Overall, 39% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

---

1 Households could select multiple options.
% of households with a nutrition LSG: 12%

% of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 12% Severe (severity score 3)
- 4% Stress (severity score 2)
- 82% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 2% Not classified

CHILD NUTRITION

- 7% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- 19% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 30% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

MESSAGING

- 93% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

OVERALL REACH

- 97% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- 88% of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- 65% of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- 21% of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 69). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 104).
% of households with a health LSG: **12%**

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- **12%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **48%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **39%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **1%** Not classified

---

**HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR**

- **52%** of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- **78%** of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location:

- **57%** NGO clinic
- **38%** Private clinic
- **30%** Pharmacy or drug shop in the market
- **4%** Government clinic
- **1%** Traditional/community healer

---

**WELLBEING**

- **53%** of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

Top 5 reported barriers:

- **36%** Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded
- **25%** Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable
- **11%** Did not receive correct medications
- **7%** No functional health facility nearby
- **6%** Health services are too far away/lack of transport

---

**ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES**

- **59%** of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation.

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (89%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (11%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 105). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

44% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):
- None: 56%
- > 0 - 500: 41%
- > 500 - 1000: 4%

COPING

31% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- 40% of households with adult women reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^1\)
- 35% of households with adult men reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^2\)
- 38% of households with children reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection\(^3\)

Most commonly reported challenges:

- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 30%, 28%, 29%
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 8%, 5%, 6%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 8%, 5%, 7%
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 3%, 1%, 1%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 2%, 2%, 5%
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to harassment: 2%, 0%, 1%
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps:
  - Adult women\(^1\)
  - Adult men\(^2\)
  - Children\(^3\)

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

% of households reporting feeling that their household’s opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives:

- Yes: 90%
- No: 9%
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 1%

ACCESSING SERVICES

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting services being too far as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Latrines (females): 15%
- Latrines (males): 14%
- Health care: 12%
- Bathing facilities (females): 10%
- Bathing facilities (males): 7%
- Food assistance: 6%

% of households having used/using/expecting to use specific services reporting inaccessibility as one of the main barriers towards accessing them:

- Health care: 3%
- Latrines (males): 2%
- Latrines (females): 2%
- Food assistance: 1%
- Bathing facilities (females): 1%
- Bathing facilities (males): 0%
- Learning facilities (girls): 0%
- Learning facilities (boys): 0%
- Bathing facilities (males): 0%

\(^1\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 106). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 100). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^3\) The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 98). Households could select up to 5 options.

\(^4\) The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 107; n, latrines (males) = 107; n, bathing facilities (females) = 107; n, bathing facilities (males) = 107; n, learning facilities (girls) = 58 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 45 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 107; n, food assistance = 107). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

Of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service

21% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 8%
- No door to door information sharing: 6%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 5%
- Don’t know where to get information/who to ask: 4%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 1%

Of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection: 99%

Of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection: 100%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

69% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
8% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
8% Consulted but opinion not taken into account related to both
6% Not consulted
6% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

9% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 6%
- The process was too complicated: 4%
- Don’t know how to read/write: 3%
- Language barriers: 1%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
% of households with multi-sectoral needs: 89%

% of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:
- Extreme (severity score 4): 10%
- Severe (severity score 3): 79%
- Stress (severity score 2): 1%
- None or minimal (severity score 1): 0%
- Not classified: 10%

% of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs:
- Shelter & non-food items: 91%
- Food security & livelihoods: 69%
- Education: 47%
- WASH: 45%
- Protection: 33%
- Health: 12%
- Nutrition: 5%

PRIORITY NEEDS

% of households reporting priority needs for 2022 (top 7, unranked):
- Shelter materials/upgrade: 77%
- Access to food: 56%
- Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 32%
- Access to self-reliance activities: 32%
- Household/cooking items: 24%
- Access to clean drinking water: 20%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 16%

Top 7 household-ranked priority needs by their average weighted score:
1. Shelter materials/upgrade: 1.70
2. Access to food: 1.55
3. Access to self-reliance activities: 0.66
4. Electricity/solar lamps/batteries: 0.44
5. Household/cooking items: 0.37
6. Access to clean drinking water: 0.33
7. Access to safe and functional latrines: 0.31

Average household size: 5.4 persons

Gender of head of household:
- Female: 19%
- Male: 81%

Gender of respondent:
- Female: 24%
- Male: 76%

Total number of household interviews: 108

1 Multi-sectoral needs: proportion of households with an MSNI severity score of at least 3, based on the severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with multi-sectoral needs (an MSNI score of 3 or higher) (n = 96).
3 Households were asked to report their top three priority needs for 2022, and then rank the three identified needs in order of importance.
4 This figure represents the proportion of households having named each option among their top three priority needs, regardless of rank.
5 Rankings were analysed using the Borda Count methodology, which determines the relative ranking of items by assigning each response a certain number of points corresponding to the position at which each household ranked it. Options ranked as the #1 need scored three points, the #2 need scored two points, and the #3 need scored one point. Aggregated ranking scores are then divided by all households, providing a final score out of a maximum of three.
6 Results in this factsheet are rounded and may therefore not always add up to 100%.
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: **91%**

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

- **0%** Extreme (severity score 4)
- **91%** Severe (severity score 3)
- **6%** Stress (severity score 2)
- **3%** None or minimal (severity score 1)
- **0%** Not classified

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:
While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

83% of households reported at least one shelter issue

Most commonly reported issues:

- Leaks during rain **80%**
- Limited ventilation **29%**
- Lack of insulation from cold **9%**
- Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there **6%**
- Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor) **5%**

% of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues:

- Damage to roof **96%**
- Damage to windows and/or doors **17%**
- Damage to walls **11%**

44% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

48% of households reported having made improvements/repairs to their shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs:

- Replaced tarpaulin **43%**
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure **22%**
- Tied down the roof/shelter **17%**
- Repaired/upgraded the windows and/or doors **4%**
- Installed bracing **3%**

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations **75%**
- No money to pay for materials **44%**
- No money to pay for labour **7%**
- Materials are unavailable **4%**
- No need to improve **18%**

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs:

- **67%** reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- **63%** reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

---

1 Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.

2 The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 90). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 Households could select multiple options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 55). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.

5 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 52). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
### RENT PAYMENT

72% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

### NON-FOOD ITEMS

% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fans</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and winter clothing</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito nets</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen sets</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COOKING FUEL

96% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.

45% of households reportedly having received LPG refills reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):

- Bought firewood: 80%
- Collected firewood: 15%
- Bought LPG refills: 7%
- Compressed Rice Husk (CRH): 2%

55% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### COPING

% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:

- To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 18%
- To pay rent: 9%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 104).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 61). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

% of households with a food security LSG: 64%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- 9% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 55% Severe (severity score 3)
- 32% No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2)
- 4% Not classified

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score:

- 6% Poor
- 44% Borderline
- 50% Acceptable

FOOD EXPENDITURE

of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- 1% None
- 4% > 0 - 500
- 9% > 500 - 1000
- 19% > 1000 - 2000
- 49% > 2000 - 5000
- 19% > 5000

FOOD ASSISTANCE

of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

- 59%

Top 7 reported challenges:

- Food items do not last until next distribution: 52%
- Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruit: 10%
- Items received through distributions are less preferred: 6%
- Items received through distributions are of low quality: 6%
- Long queues at distribution points: 6%
- Lack of response when issues are reported: 4%
- Distribution points are too far/lack of transport: 2%

LIVELIHOODS

of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

- 66%

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

2 Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket)\(^1\)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Below SMEB} & 62\% & 79\% \\
\hline
\text{Between SMEB and MEB} & 17\% & 9\% \\
\hline
\text{Above MEB} & 4\% & 9\% \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

- Including imputed amount of assistance
- Excluding imputed amount of assistance

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^2\)

- To access or pay for food: 85%
- To access or pay for clothing, shoes: 18%
- To access or pay for healthcare: 15%
- To pay rent: 9%
- To access or pay for education: 7%
- To repair or build shelter: 7%
- To access or pay for hygiene items: 1%

% of households reportedly having exhausted or adopted... of households reported having exhausted or adopted coping strategies due to a lack of money to meet basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection\(^2\)

- 69% of households by coping strategy

- Borrowing money to buy food: 55%
- Buying food on credit: 62%
- Spending savings: 72%
- Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations: 95%
- Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance: 89%
- Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food money: 91%
- Reducing essential non-food expenditures: 97%
- Selling jewelry/gold: 69%
- Selling household goods: 79%
- Selling labour in advance: 99%
- Selling productive assets or means of transport: 100%
- Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 100%
- Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions: 100%
- Entire household migrated: 100%
- Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs: 100%
- Child marriage: 100%
- Begging: 100%

- Adopted coping strategy
- Coping strategy not available to household
- Exhausted coping strategy

- No need to adopt coping strategy

\(^1\) In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g., hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); education-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

\(^2\) The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

\(^3\) Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

\(^4\) Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

\(^5\) Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

\(^6\) Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
% of households with a WASH LSG: 46%

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 0% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 46% Severe (severity score 3)
- 17% Stress (severity score 2)
- 37% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 98% of households reported having soap at the time of data collection
- 51% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER QUANTITIES

- 44% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Drinking: 14%
- Cooking: 19%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 31%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 31%
- Other domestic purposes: 34%

COPING

- 45% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 35%
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 14%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 9%
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 8%
5. Reduce drinking water consumption: 4%

WATER SOURCE

- 83% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 11% Deep tubewell
- 5% Shallow tubewell
- 1% Protected well

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
### SANITATION FACILITIES

% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 55%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 25%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 19%
- VIP toilet: 2%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 18%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 16%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 10%
- Latrines are not functioning: 9%
- Females feel unsafe using latrines, because they are not (appropriately) gender-segregated: 6%

#### Males
- Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding: 19%
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic: 19%
- Lack of light inside latrines: 10%
- Latrines are not functioning: 8%
- Latrines are too far: 7%

### BATHING FACILITIES

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

#### Females
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 19%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 5%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 5%
- Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 5%
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach: 4%

#### Males
- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded: 17%
- Bathing facilities are too far: 6%
- Lack of light inside bathing facilities: 5%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way/ at facility: 5%
- Bathing facilities are not functioning: 2%

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 74%
- > 1 bin at household level: 10%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 27%
- None: 3%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 56%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 26%
- Throws waste in the open: 8%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 17%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 9%
% of households with a education LSG: 46%

% of households per education LSG severity score:

- **Extreme** (severity score 4): 2%
- **Severe** (severity score 3): 44%
- **Stress** (severity score 2): 36%
- **None or minimal** (severity score 1): 15%
- **Not classified**: 3%

### PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as **not having been enrolled in learning facilities** before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak

- Girls: 52%
- Boys: 53%

### HOME-BASED LEARNING

of households reported at least one school-aged child as **not having regularly accessed home-based learning** since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021

- Girls: 56%
- Boys: 31%

**Top 5 reported challenges/reasons**

- **Girls**
  - Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 27%
  - Marriage and/or pregnancy: 14%
  - Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 11%
  - Household does not consider education important: 7%
  - No home-based learning offered: 7%

- **Boys**
  - Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled: 23%
  - Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning: 12%
  - No home-based learning offered: 9%
  - Marriage: 8%
  - Lack of light in shelter: 5%

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 98; households with boys, n = 86 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
EDUCATION

SENDING BACK

51% of households reported at least one school-aged child that will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open.

52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that will not be sent back.

30% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that will not be sent back.

% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open reporting expecting challenges once children will be sent back.

Girls

Boys

Top 5 reported challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at learning facility</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Security concerns of child travelling to or being at learning facility</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of structured schooling</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of qualified teaching staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor learning facility infrastructure</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPING

7% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for education.

EXPENDITURES

31% of households reported having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 77). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 66). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 53). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 74 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 49 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
5 The denominator for this indicator is households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back (households with at least one girl that will reportedly be sent back, n = 50 - results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error; households with at least one boy that will reportedly not be sent back, n = 57 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
6 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
% of households with a protection LSG: **31%**

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 29% Severe (severity score 3)
- 10% Stress (severity score 2)
- 54% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 6% Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

31% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

- Safe areas for playing: 19%
- Education: 17%
- Alternative care: 6%
- Food: 5%
- Safety and security: 3%
- Shelter: 2%
- Psychosocial support: 2%

*Households could select multiple options.*

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

- Women/girls: 20% of top 5 reported areas
- Men/boys: 19% of top 5 reported areas

Top 5 reported areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women/girls</th>
<th>Men/boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13% On their way to different facilities</td>
<td>11% On their way to different facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Markets</td>
<td>6% Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Distribution sites</td>
<td>5% Social/community areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Social/community areas</td>
<td>5% On the way to collect firewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Nearby forests/open spaces or farms</td>
<td>4% Nearby forests/open spaces or farms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.
POUNTS-OF-CONTACT

% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact¹

- Majhi: 84% (1% would not send)
- Camps-in-Charge (CICs): 57% (9% would not send)
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 20% (2% would not send)
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 19% (1% would not send)
- Law enforcement officials: 16% (13% would not send)
- Health facilities: 11% (1% would not send)
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 7% (3% would not send)
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 6% (8% would not send)
- Psychosocial service providers: 2% (2% would not send)
- Legal aid service providers: 0% (1% would not send)
- None: 69% (1% would not send)
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 6% (1% would not send)

PROTECTION NEEDS

% of households reporting type of support needed

- Improved safety and security in general: 56%
- Improved safety and security for women and girls: 31%
- Mental health & psychosocial support: 18%
- Access to justice and mediation: 7%

Overall, 38% of households reported that they would refer to any of the "recommended" points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorised representatives.

¹ Households could select multiple options.
### NUTRITION

#### % of households with a nutrition LSG:

- **8%**

*see Annex 1 for details on methodology*

#### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(severity score 1)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(severity score 2)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(severity score 3)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(severity score 4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILD NUTRITION

- **3%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)

- **14%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- **38%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan

#### MESSAGING

- **97%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

#### OVERALL REACH

- **98%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

#### CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- **89%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan

- **79%** of households reported mothers or caregivers having screened at least one of their children aged 6-59 months for malnutrition using MUAC tape since the start of Ramadan

#### ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- **22%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan

---

The mother-led MUAC programme is a programme that trains caregivers in measuring the mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) of their children to identify malnutrition, and learn how and where to refer a malnourished child. However, during the reference period used for data collection, access to communities was reduced in line with COVID-19 preventative measures, and the programme was not equally disseminated in all camps.

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 63). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 106).
**Health**

**% of households with a health LSG:**

12%

See Annex 1 for details on methodology

**% of households per health LSG severity score:**

- Severe (severity score 3)
- Stress (severity score 2)
- None or minimal (severity score 1)

- 12%
- 39%
- 47%
- 2%

**Wellbeing**

59% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**Health-seeking behaviour**

84% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- NGO clinic 72%
- Private clinic 29%
- Pharmacy or drug shop in the market 23%
- Government clinic 5%
- Traditional/ community healer 1%

**Barriers**

40% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care.

- Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded 29%
- Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable 12%
- Did not receive correct medications 7%
- No functional health facility nearby 4%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health facility 3%

**Access to health services**

- % of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:
  - 0 - < 20 min 68%
  - 20 - 30 min 31%
  - > 30 min 1%

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (81%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (18%).

---

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 135). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

42% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT)

None 58% 41% 1%
> 0 - 500
> 500 - 1000

COPING

15% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 74). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
SITE MANAGEMENT

MOBILITY AROUND CAMPS

- Of households with adult women, 26% reported that adult women in their household faced challenges moving around camps at the time of data collection.
- Of households with adult men, 26% reported that adult men in their household faced challenges moving around camps.
- Of households with children, 28% reported that children in their household faced challenges moving around camps.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

- 91% of households reported feeling that their household's opinions and concerns are being heard and taken into consideration by their community representatives.
- 6% of households responded no.
- 3% of households responded don't know / prefer not to answer.

ACCESSING SERVICES

- 7% of households reported latrines (males) as one of the main barriers towards accessing them.
- 6% of households reported latrines (females) as one of the main barriers.
- 5% of households reported bathing facilities (males) as one of the main barriers.
- 5% of households reported bathing facilities (females) as one of the main barriers.
- 4% of households reported health care as a barrier.
- 2% of households reported food assistance as a barrier.

Most commonly reported challenges:
- Challenges walking on pathways that are blocked, damaged or slippery: 18% (16%, 22%)
- Distances have become longer due to fencing: 6% (7%, 6%)
- Challenges walking up pathways that are too steep: 5% (4%, 2%)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp at night: 5% (6%, 7%)
- Older persons face difficulties moving around camps: 4% (4%, NA)
- It is dangerous for them to move around the camp during the day due to traffic: 4% (2%, 6%)
- Persons with disabilities face difficulties moving around: 1% (1%, 2%)

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 108). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 103). Households could select up to 5 options.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 96). Households could select up to 5 options.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 108; n, latrines (males) = 106; n, bathing facilities (females) = 108; n, bathing facilities (males) = 106; n, learning facilities (girls) = 73 - results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 46 - results are representative with a +/- 15% margin of error.; n, health care = 106; n, food assistance = 107). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

63% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-food items</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site management/development</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection services</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote education</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition services</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 12%
- Messages are not clear/understandable: 8%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 3%
- Don't know where to get information/who to ask: 3%
- No door to door information sharing: 3%

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

% of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection.

65% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid
11% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality
11% Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both
6% Consulted but opinion not taken into account
6% Not consulted
1% Don’t know / prefer not to answer

8% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:
- The process was too complicated: 6%
- Had fear about confidentiality: 3%
- No response/reaction received to feedback: 3%
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 2%
- Language barriers: 1%

1 Households were asked separately about each type of service.
2 Households could select up to 3 options.
3 Households could select up to 5 options.
### % of households with multi-sectoral needs:

**87%**

---

### % of households per Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI) severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (severity score 4)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (severity score 3)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (severity score 2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or Minimal (severity score 1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### PRIORITY NEEDS

#### % of households with sectoral living standard gaps (LSGs) among households with multi-sectoral needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectoral Living Standard Gap</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security &amp; livelihoods</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; non-food items</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### POPULATION PROFILE

#### Gender of head of household:

- Female (50%)
- Male (50%)

#### Gender of respondent:

- Female (31%)
- Male (69%)

#### Average household size: 4.8 persons

#### % of households by reported period of arrival at the current camp:

- Before October 2016: 48%
- October 2016 - 24 August 2017: 7%
- After 24 August 2017: 45%

#### Total number of household interviews: 121
SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

% of households with a shelter & NFI LSG: 72%

- See Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per shelter & NFI LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity Score</th>
<th>% of Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on the impact of the August flood event of shelter & NFI results:

While the flood event at the start of August did not have any notable impact on overall shelter & NFI needs, it may have had a slight impact on results related to NFIs, as well as LPG.

SHELTER ISSUES & IMPROVEMENTS

- 68% of households reported at least one shelter issue¹

  Most commonly reported issues:
  - Leaks during rain: 66%
  - Limited ventilation: 21%
  - Lack of insulation from cold: 7%
  - Shelter has severe structural damage but household is still staying there: 5%
  - Presence of dirt or debris (unfinished floor): 2%

- % of households reporting reasons for shelter issues (top 3) among households reportedly having had shelter issues² ³:
  - Damage to roof: 96%
  - Damage to walls: 13%
  - Damage to windows and/or doors: 7%

- 42% of households reported not having made improvements/repairs to their shelter despite having reported issues

- 21% of households reported having incurred expenditures for shelter maintenance or repair in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 5 reported improvements/repairs³:

- Replaced tarpaulin: 31%
- Repaired/upgraded the roof structure: 14%
- Tied down the roof/shelter: 11%
- Installed bracing: 6%
- Installed gutter: 5%

% of households reporting main reasons for not having improved or repaired their shelter (top 5) among households not having made improvements/repairs⁴:

- Did not receive any/sufficient shelter support from humanitarian organisations: 59%
- No money to pay for materials: 30%
- No money to pay for labour: 5%
- No able-bodied household member available to make repairs: 1%
- No need to improve: 35%

Among households that made shelter improvements/repairs...³ ⁵:

- 68% ... reported having received shelter materials from a humanitarian organisation
- 59% ... reported having purchased shelter materials themselves

¹ Households were asked separately about each shelter issue.
² The denominator for this indicator is all households having reported shelter issues (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
³ Households could select multiple options.
⁴ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having made any improvements (n = 80). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select up to 3 options.
⁵ The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having made improvements (n = 41). Results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.
### SHELTER & NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs)

#### Rent Payment

12% of households reported having had to pay or exchange goods/labour to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection.

#### Non-Food Items

- **% of households reporting having had insufficient NFIs at the time of data collection, by NFI:**
  - Fans: 94%
  - Shoes: 79%
  - Torches/handheld lights and batteries or solar lamps/panels: 73%
  - Clothing and winter clothing: 67%
  - Kitchen sets: 52%
  - Blankets: 44%
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats and bedding items: 40%
  - Mosquito nets: 40%

#### Coping

- **% of households among households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reporting having adopted those strategies for shelter/NFI-related reasons:**
  - To access or pay for clothes, shoes: 13%
  - To repair or build shelter: 10%
  - To pay electricity bill/solar batteries: 5%
  - To access or pay for cooking fuel: 5%
  - To access or pay for household items: 4%
  - To pay rent: 2%

#### Cooking Fuel

- 96% of households reported having received LPG refills from humanitarian actors in the 3 months prior to data collection.
- 44% of households reported that refills always lasted until the next distribution.

- **% of households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last reporting alternative sources of cooking fuel (top 4):**
  - Bought firewood: 60%
  - Collected firewood: 24%
  - Bought LPG refills: 19%
  - Kerosene or other combustible: 3%

- 50% of households reported an expenditure on fuel in the 30 days prior to data collection.

---

1 Households were asked separately about each NFI. When interpreting the results, users are reminded that data collection took place during the monsoon season.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having received LPG refills (n = 116).

4 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly not having received LPG refills or having received LPG refills that did not last (n = 70). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.
FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS

% of households with a food security LSG: 76%

% of households per food security LSG severity score:

- Extreme (severity score 4): 15%
- Severe (severity score 3): 61%
- No/minimal / stress (severity score 1 or 2): 24%
- Not classified: 0%

FOOD CONSUMPTION

% of households by Food Consumption Score¹

- Poor: 13%
- Borderline: 46%
- Acceptable: 40%

FOOD EXPENDITURE

- 98% of households reported having spent money on food in the 30 days prior to data collection

FOOD ASSISTANCE

- 46% of households reported having faced challenges related to food assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection

Top 7 reported challenges²:

1. Food items do not last until next distribution
2. Items received through distributions are of low quality
3. Long queues at distribution points
4. Distribution points are too far/lack of transport
5. Cannot access sufficient vegetables/fruits
6. Risk of infection with COVID-19 on the way or at distribution site
7. Items received through distributions are less preferred

LIVELIHOODS

- 76% of households reported having had a livelihood other than humanitarian assistance and/or other types of support (e.g. from family/friends, donations, etc.) in the 30 days prior to data collection

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

² Households could select up to 5 options.
MINIMUM EXPENDITURE BASKET

% of households by average monthly per capita expenditure in the 30 days prior to data collection in relation to the MEB (MEB = Minimum Expenditure Basket; SMEB = Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket).1

- 61% Below SMEB
- 23% Between SMEB and MEB
- 15% Above MEB

• Including imputed amount of assistance
• Excluding imputed amount of assistance

% of households by coping strategy

- 68% Borrowing money to buy food
- 42% Buying food on credit
- 45% Spending savings
- 20% Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations
- 9% Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance
- 2% Asking other community members for food support due to a lack of food/money
- 9% Reducing essential non-food expenditures
- 1% Selling jewelry/gold
- 20% Selling household goods
- 17% Selling labour in advance
- 10% Selling productive assets or means of transport
- 9% Adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions
- 8% Children working long hours or in hazardous conditions
- 10% Entire household migrated
- 10% Accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs
- 10% Child marriage
- 10% Begging

Spending including the imputed amount of assistance refers to the average monthly per capita expenditure, plus the estimated average monthly per capita value of assistance received and consumed. Spending excluding the imputed amount of assistance refers to only the average monthly per capita expenditure.

LIVELIHOODS-BASED COPING STRATEGIES

% of households reporting reasons for adopting coping strategies (top 7) among households reportedly having adopted coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection2

To access or pay for food 90%
To access or pay for healthcare 37%
To access or pay for education 15%
To access or pay for clothes, shoes 13%
To repair or build shelter 10%
To access or pay for electricity bill/ solar batteries 5%
To access or pay for cooking fuel 5%

• Adopted coping strategy
• Coping strategy not available to household

% of households reported having exhausted or adopted...

... stress coping strategies3 4 66%
... crisis coping strategies3 5 21%
... emergency coping strategies3 6 2%

1 In line with REVA 4, SMEB and MEB thresholds were set as: BDT 1,138 monthly per capita spending as the SMEB threshold, and BDT 1,736 monthly per capita spending as the MEB threshold. The following expenditure items were included in the calculation: food items (spending and value of assistance); non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items, such as soap, detergents, sanitary materials for women and girls, etc.) (spending and value of assistance); fuel (spending and value of assistance); transportation (spending and value of assistance); shelter maintenance or repair (spending); non-food household items for infrequent purchase (e.g. blankets, cooking pots, clothing, lightbulbs, etc.) (spending); health-related expenditures (spending); education-related expenditures (spending); livelihood inputs (for agriculture, fishing, business) (spending).

2 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted any coping strategy (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Households could select multiple options.

3 Households were asked separately about each coping strategy. Having exhausted a coping strategy referred to having adopted it in the past and not being able to adopt it anymore, while a coping strategy not being available to households referred to households not having the means to use this coping strategy/the strategy not being applicable to the household.

4 Stress coping strategies include: selling household goods; selling jewelry/gold; spending savings; buying food on credit; borrowing money to buy food; selling labour in advance.

5 Crisis coping strategies include: selling productive assets or means of transport; reducing essential non-food expenditures; asking other community members for food support due to a lack of money/fod; selling, sharing and exchanging food rations; selling non-food items that were provided as assistance; adults working long hours or in hazardous conditions.

6 Emergency coping strategies include: begging; children working long hours or in hazardous conditions; child marriage; accepting high-risk, illegal/temporary jobs; entire household migrated.
WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE (WASH)

% of households with a WASH LSG: 54%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per WASH LSG severity score:

- 2% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 52% Severe (severity score 3)
- 17% Stress (severity score 2)
- 26% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 3% Not classified

HYGIENE ITEMS

- 99% of households reported having had soap at the time of data collection
- 47% of households reported having spent money on non-food household items for regular purchase (e.g. hygiene items) in the 30 days prior to data collection

WATER SOURCE

- 48% Piped water tap/tapstand into settlement site
- 24% Shallow tubewell
- 21% Deep tubewell
- 5% Deep or shallow tubewell (unknown)

WATER QUANTITIES

- 38% of households reporting not having had enough water for at least one purpose at the time of data collection

% of households reporting not having had enough water, by purpose:

- Drinking: 7%
- Cooking: 12%
- Personal hygiene at bathing location: 23%
- Personal hygiene at shelter: 24%
- Other domestic purposes: 28%

COPING

- 60% of households reporting adopting coping strategies to adapt to a lack of water

Top 5 reported strategies:

1. Fetch water at a source further than the usual one: 48%
2. Reduce water consumption for purposes other than drinking: 12%
3. Rely on less preferred water sources for purposes other than drinking: 10%
4. Rely on less preferred water sources for drinking water: 8%
5. Reduce drinking water consumption: 6%

1 Households could select multiple options. The question referred to coping strategies they would adopt at any time throughout the year, without a specific recall period.
SANITATION FACILITIES
% of households reporting sanitation facility the household usually uses (top 4)

- Flush or pour/flush toilet: 58%
- Pit latrine with a slab and platform: 24%
- Pit latrine without a slab or platform: 16%
- VIP toilet: 2%

% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to latrines females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are too far</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are difficult to reach</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrines are not functioning</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BATHING FACILITIES
% of households with female or male individuals reporting problems related to bathing facilities females/males in their households faced at the time of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are too far</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are not functioning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing facilities are difficult to reach</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WASTE MANAGEMENT
% of households reporting types of bins they have access to at the time of data collection

- 1 bin at household level: 55%
- > 1 bin at household level: 30%
- Access to communal bin/pit: 18%
- None: 12%

% of households reporting where they usually dispose of household waste, and how (segregated/not segregated)

- Bin at household level (segregated): 50%
- Bin at household level (not segregated): 27%
- Throws waste in the open: 19%
- Communal bin/pit (segregated): 17%
- Communal bin/pit (not segregated): 4%
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EDUCATION

% of households with a education LSG: 47%

see Annex 1 for details on methodology

% of households per education LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSG</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme (severity score 4)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe (severity score 3)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (severity score 2)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal (severity score 1)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-COVID ENROLMENT

46% of households reported at least one school-aged (6-18 years) child as not having been enrolled in learning facilities before learning facilities closed in March 2020 due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

33% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having been enrolled.

HOME-BASED LEARNING

48% of households reported at least one school-aged child as not having regularly accessed home-based learning since the start of the 2021 school year until support for home-based learning stopped in March 2021.

52% of households reporting at least one school-aged girl as not having accessed home-based learning.

38% of households reporting at least one school-aged boy as not having accessed home-based learning.

% of households with children aged 3-24 reporting challenges girls and boys aged 3-24 in the household faced towards benefitting from or reasons they could not do any home-based learning:

Girls

- 57%

Boys

Top 5 reported challenges/reasons

Girls

- 22% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 13% Marriage and/or pregnancy
- 5% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 5% Children cannot concentrate at home
- 5% Household does not consider education important

Boys

- 10% Home-based learning is not effective/children have fallen behind on learning
- 10% Lack of guidance from learning facilitators
- 9% Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
- 6% Children cannot concentrate at home
- 6% Lack of quality learning materials at home

1 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 6-18 (n = 87). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error. Results are presented out of all households with children aged 6-18, which may not correspond to the target population for Education Sector support.
2 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls aged 6-18 (n = 56). Results are representative with a +/- 14% margin of error.
3 The denominator for this indicator is households with boys aged 6-18 (n = 72). Results are representative with a +/- 12% margin of error.
4 The denominator for this indicator is households with girls or boys aged 3-24 (households with girls, n = 99; households with boys, n = 87 - results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.). Households could select up to 5 options.
### EDUCATION

#### SENDING BACK

- **47%** of households reported at least one school-aged child that **will not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open**.

- **50%** of households reporting at least one school-aged girl that **will not be sent back**.

- **33%** of households reporting at least one school-aged boy that **will not be sent back**.

- **% of households with at least one girl or boy aged 3-24 that will reportedly not be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open** reporting **main reasons for not sending them back (top 5)**:
  - **43%** Not enrolled in education pre-COVID/never enrolled
  - **34%** Marriage and/or pregnancy
  - **25%** Children are too old now
  - **10%** Household does not consider education important
  - **6%** Children are too young still

#### EXPENDITURES

- **% of households reporting having incurred education-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection** reporting having done so to **access or pay for education**.

#### COPING

- **15%** of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection.
**PROTECTION**

% of households with a protection LSG: **30%**

% of households per protection LSG severity score:

- 5% Extreme (severity score 4)
- 25% Severe (severity score 3)
- 15% Stress (severity score 2)
- 47% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 8% Not classified

**Limitations**

- Limitations related to remote data collection, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, limited possibilities to ensure privacy, and possibly enhanced concerns of respondents related to the confidentiality of their information, may particularly affect the accuracy of findings related to sensitive topics.
- Moreover, vulnerable households (with enhanced protection concerns) may be less likely to have or use mobile phones. Therefore, sensitive issues may be under-reported.
- The reduced Protection Sector footprint between April and September this year, as a result of COVID-19-related preventative measures, as well as a sometimes potentially limited understanding of protection and the different services offered by protection actors, may have impacted respondents’ perceptions of the types of services available.

**CHILD NEEDS**

37% of households reported perceiving that needs of children in their community were not adequately met to ensure their well-being at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting unmet child needs, by type of need (top 7):

- Education 18%
- Safe areas for playing 18%
- Food 13%
- Safety and security 10%
- Shelter 6%
- Alternative care 4%
- Health care 2%

**SAFETY & SECURITY**

% of households reporting areas considered unsafe by girls and women, or boys and men, in the community at the time of data collection:

Women/Boys:

- 19% Latrines or bathing facilities
- 7% Markets
- 7% Social/community areas
- 5% In transportation
- 4% Distribution sites

Men/Boys:

- 17% Markets
- 7% In transportation
- 5% Social/community areas
- 3% Nearby forests/open spaces or farms
- 4% On their way to different facilities

18% of households reported the safety and security situation in their neighbourhood and area of residence to have deteriorated compared to the previous 12 months.

Households could select multiple options.
% of households reporting where they would or would not send a friend for care and support in case of assault or abuse, by point-of-contact

- Camps-in-Charge (CiCs): 83% would send, 1% would not send
- Majhi: 69% would send, 2% would not send
- Health facilities: 30% would send, 2% would not send
- Law enforcement officials: 26% would send, 8% would not send
- Ombudsman/national human rights institutions: 19% would send, 0% would not send
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centres: 17% would send, 1% would not send
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms: 16% would send, 4% would not send
- Psychosocial service providers: 4% would send, 5% would not send
- Legal aid service providers: 4% would send, 7% would not send
- Family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives: 4% would send, 2% would not send
- None: 0% would send, 75% would not send
- Don’t know / prefer not to answer: 0% would send, 7% would not send

Overall, 50% of households reported that they would refer to any of the “recommended” points-of-contact, including health facilities, psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers), ombudsman/national human rights institutions, women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers, family/relatives/guardians, curators or legal authorized representatives.

1 Households could select multiple options.
### NUTRITION

#### % of households with a nutrition LSG:

- **9%**

#### % of households per nutrition LSG severity score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILD NUTRITION

- **7%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported not having received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one of these children since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)\(^1\)
- **19%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as not having been screened for malnutrition by community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)
- **24%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported at least one child as having been screened and referred, or already having been enrolled, and having received treatment for malnutrition since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### MESSAGING

- **95%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc. from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### OVERALL REACH

- **98%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having had some form of contact with nutrition service providers since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

This indicator considers any form of contact, including screening by nutrition facility staff or volunteers, involvement in the caregiver-led MUAC programme, having received blanket supplementary feeding, and having received messages related to infant and young child feeding practices.

### CAREGIVER-LED SCREENING

- **90%** of households with children aged 6-59 months reported having received messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme from community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff since the start of Ramadan\(^1\)

### ADOLESCENT GIRLS

- **23%** of households with adolescent girls (10-19 years) reported at least one adolescent girl as having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan\(^2\)

---

1. The denominator for this indicator is households with children aged 6-59 months (n = 59). Results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.
2. The denominator for this indicator is households with adolescent girls (n = 119).
HEALTH

% of households with a health LSG: 7%

% of households per health LSG severity score:

- 7% Severe (severity score 3)
- 37% Stress (severity score 2)
- 56% None or minimal (severity score 1)
- 0% Not classified

WELLBEING

46% of households reported at least one household member as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection.

HEALTH-SEEKING BEHAVIOUR

88% of household members who were reported as having had a health problem and needing to access health care in the 3 months prior to data collection sought treatment at a clinic.

- 72% NGO clinic
- 27% Private clinic
- 27% Pharmacy or drug shop in the market
- 12% Government clinic
- 2% Traditional/ community healer

% of individuals reported as having had a health problem and needing to access treatment in the 3 months prior to data collection by treatment location.

BARRIERS

49% of households reported having experienced or expecting experiencing barriers when needing to access health care:

- 31% Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable
- 26% Long waiting time for the service/ overcrowded
- 12% Did not receive correct medications
- 8% No functional health facility nearby
- 7% Health services are too far away/lack of transport

ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES

% of households reporting travel time to get to the nearest functional health facility by their normal mode of transportation:

- 66% 0 - < 20 min
- 22% 20 - 30 min
- 12% > 30 min

Most commonly households reported that they would be walking (86%) to the health facility, followed by using tuk tuks (13%).

1 The denominator for this indicator is all individuals having had a health problem and needing to access health care (n = 103). Households could select multiple options.

2 Households could select up to 3 options.

see Annex 1 for details on methodology
HEALTH

EXPENDITURES

36% of households reported having incurred health-related expenditures in the 3 months prior to data collection.

36% of households reporting total monthly expenditure, by range (BDT):

- None: 64%
- > 0 - 500: 36%
- > 500 - 1000: 1%

COPING

37% of households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection reported having done so to access or pay for health care.

1 The denominator for this indicator is households reportedly having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies (n = 82). Results are representative with a +/- 11% margin of error.
The denominator for this indicator is households with adult women (n = 121). Households could select up to 5 options. Households were asked to report mobility challenges for all target groups (adult women, adult men, children) present in the household.

2 The denominator for this indicator is households with adult men (n = 105). Households could select up to 5 options.

3 The denominator for this indicator is households with children (n = 115). Households could select up to 5 options.

4 The denominator for this indicator is households having accessed specific services (n, latrines (females) = 121; n, latrines (males) = 119; n, bathing facilities (females) = 121; n, bathing facilities (males) = 119; n, learning facilities (girls) = 63 - results are representative with a +/- 13% margin of error.; n, learning facilities (boys) = 40 - results are representative with a +/- 16% margin of error.; n, health care = 121; n, food assistance = 121). Households could select up to 5 options for barriers related to latrines, bathing facilities, food assistance and learning facilities. They could select up to 3 options for barriers related to health care. For learning facilities, barriers preventing return are included. For recall periods, please refer to the respective sector sections.
COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES

ACCESSING INFORMATION

- 89% of households reported not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information on at least one type of services / assistance in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- % of households reporting not having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information, by type of service:
  - Non-food items: 72%
  - Livelihoods: 59%
  - Shelter: 39%
  - Remote education: 37%
  - Site management/development: 35%
  - Protection services: 26%
  - Health services: 25%
  - Water: 14%
  - Nutrition services: 14%
  - Sanitation: 12%
  - Food assistance: 7%

- 27% of households reported having faced problems when accessing (receiving and understanding) information in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported problems:
- Aid workers do not share/disclose: 12%
- No door to door information sharing: 6%
- The information shared is irrelevant / no new information is shared: 5%
- Don't know where to get information/ who to ask: 3%
- Not enough information on how to access specific services available: 2%

- 99% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to cyclones in the 6 months prior to data collection.

- 100% of households reported having been able to access (receive and understand) enough clear information related to COVID-19 in the 6 months prior to data collection.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- % of households reporting having been consulted and felt that aid providers took their household’s opinion into account related to the type of aid they would like to receive and how they would like to receive it in the 6 months prior to data collection:
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to type of aid: 74%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to modality: 7%
  - Consulted and opinion taken into account related to both: 7%
  - Consulted but opinion not taken into account: 9%
  - Not consulted: 3%
  - Don't know / prefer not to answer: 1%

- 11% of households reported having faced challenges when providing feedback or complaints on any issues related to aid or the process of receiving aid in the 6 months prior to data collection.

Top 5 reported challenges:
- Did not know where/whom/how to provide feedback: 7%
- The process was too complicated: 4%
- Mistreated when providing feedback: 3%
- Don't know how to read/write: 2%
- Response to feedback was not satisfactory/timely: 2%

Households were asked separately about each type of service.
Households could select up to 3 options.
Households could select up to 5 options.
ANNEX 1: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

SEVERITY SCALE

The severity scale is inspired by the draft Joint Inter-Sectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF), an analytical framework being developed at the global level aiming to enhance the understanding of needs of affected populations. It measures a progressive deterioration of a household’s situation, towards the worst possible humanitarian outcome (see figure on the right).

While the JIAF severity scale includes 5 classifications ranging from 1 (none/minimal) to 5 (catastrophic), for the purpose of the MSNA, only a scale of 1 (none/minimal) to 4+ (extreme+) is used. A “4+” score is used where data indicates that the situation could be catastrophic. This is because data that is needed for a score of 5 (catastrophic) is primarily at area level (for example, mortality rates, malnutrition prevalence, burden of disease, etc.) which is difficult to factor into household-level analyses. Additionally, as global guidelines on the exact definitions of each class are yet to be finalised, and given the response implications of classifying a household or area as class 5 (catastrophic), REACH is not in a position to independently verify if a class 5 is occurring.

DEFINITIONS

- Living Standards Gap (LSG): signifies an unmet need in a given sector, where the LSG severity score is 3 or higher.
- Capacity Gap (CG): signifies that negative and unsustainable coping strategies are used to meet needs. Households not categorised as having an LSG may be maintaining their living standards through the use of negative coping strategies.

IDENTIFICATION OF LIVING STANDARDS GAPS (LSGs)

The LSG for a given sector is produced by aggregating unmet needs indicators per sector. For the MSNA, a simple aggregation methodology has been identified, building on the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) aggregation approach. Using this method, for the MPI, each household is assigned a “deprivation” score according to its deprivations in the component indicators. The deprivation score of each household is obtained by calculating the percentage of the deprivations experienced, so that the deprivation score for each household lies between 0 and 100. The method relies on the categorisation of each indicator on a binary scale: does (“1”) / does not (“0”) have a gap. The threshold for how a household is considered to have a particular gap or not is determined in advance for each indicator. The MSNA aggregation methodology outlined below can be described as “MPI-like”, using the steps of the MPI approach to determine an aggregated needs severity score, with the addition of “critical indicators” that determine the higher severity scores. The section below outlines how the household-level aggregation is done.

1) Identify indicators that measure needs (‘gaps’) for each sector, capturing the following key dimensions: accessibility, availability, quality, use, and awareness. Set binary thresholds: does (“1”) / does not (“0”) have a gap.
2) Identify critical indicators that, on their own, indicate a gap in the sector overall.
3) Identify individual indicator scores (0 or 1) for each household, once data had been collected.
4) Calculate the severity score for each household, based on the following decision tree (tailored to each sector).
   a. “Super” critical indicator(s): by themselves could lead to a 4+ if an extreme situation is found for the household.
   b. Critical indicators: Using a decision tree approach, a severity class is identified based on a discontinued scale of 1 to 4 (1, 3, 4) depending on the scores of each of the critical indicators.
   c. Non-critical indicators: the scores of all non-critical indicators are summed up and converted into a percentage of the possible total (e.g. 3 out of 4 = 75%) to identify a severity class.
   d. The final score/severity class is obtained by retaining the highest score generated by either the “super” critical, critical or non-critical indicators, as outlined in the figure below.
5) Calculate the proportion of the population with a final severity score of 3 and above, per sector. Having a severity score of 3 and above in a sector is considered as having a LSG in that sector.

6) Identify households that do not have a LSG but that do have a CG.
   a. Identify individual indicator scores (0 or 1) for all CG indicators, among households with a severity score of 1 or 2.
   b. If any CG indicator has a score of 1, the household is categorised as having a CG.

7) Project the percentage findings onto the population data that was used to build the sample, with accurate weighting to ensure best possible representativeness.

The Multi-Sector Needs Index (MSNI) is a measure of the household’s overall severity of humanitarian needs (expressed on a scale of 1 - 4+), based on the highest severity of sectoral LSG severity scores identified in each household.

The MSNI is determined through the following steps:

1) First, the severity of each of the sectoral LSGs is calculated per household, as outlined above.
2) Next, a final severity score (MSNI) is determined for each household based on the highest severity of sectoral LSGs identified in each household.
   - As shown in the example below, household (HH) 1 has a final MSNI of 4, because that is the highest severity score, across all sectoral LSGs, within that household.

Examples of MSNI scores per household based on sectoral analysis findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectoral LSG Severity Score</th>
<th>Final MSNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Sec</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key limitation: regardless of whether a household has a very severe LSG in just one sector (e.g. WASH for HH 2 above) OR co-occurring severe LSGs across multiple sectors (e.g. food security, health, WASH, protection for HH 1 above), their final MSNI score will be the same (4). While this might make sense from a “big picture” response planning perspective (if a household has an extreme need in even one sector, this may warrant humanitarian intervention regardless of the co-occurrence with other sectoral needs), additional analysis (as shown on page 4) should be done to understand such differences in magnitude of severity between households.
## ANNEX 2: CRITICAL INDICATORS FEEDING INTO LSGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter &amp; non-food items (NFIs)</td>
<td>% of households reporting at least one enclosure issue, by type of issue</td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening) - Indications of total collapse of living standards, with potentially immediately life-threatening outcomes (increased risk of mortality and/or irreversible harm to physical or mental well-being).</td>
<td>Extreme (4) - Collapse of living standards. (Risk of) significant harm to physical or mental well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (2) - Living standards are under stress. Minimal (risk of) impact on physical or mental well-being/stressed physical or mental well-being overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting having had to pay rent or provide anything to live in their current shelter in the 6 months prior to data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security &amp; livelihoods</td>
<td>Food Consumption Score</td>
<td>Poor (0-28) OR</td>
<td>Borderline (&gt;28-42) OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>None/minimal (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non emergency coping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis (adopted or exhausted):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling productive assets or means of transport (sewing machines, wheel barrow, bicycle, livestock etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce essential non-food expenditures such as education, health and clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Asked other community members for a support of food because of a lack of food/ money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling, sharing and exchanging food rations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adults working long hours (&gt;43 hours) or work in hazardous conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO emergency/crisis copeming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (adopted or exhausted):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling household goods (radio, furniture, mobile, solar panel, television, clothes, kitchen items, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling jewelry/gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spending savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Buying food on credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Borrowing money to buy food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO emergency/crisis/stress coping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livelihoods-based coping</td>
<td>Emergency (adopted or exhausted):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Begging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Children working long hours (&gt;43 hours) or work in hazardous conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Child marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept high risks, illegal temporary job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Entire household migrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs (ECMEN)</td>
<td>&lt; SMEB (1,138/capita/month)</td>
<td>&gt; MEB (BDT 1,736/capita/month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;= SMEB &amp; &lt; MEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water, sanitation &amp; hygiene (WASH)</td>
<td>% of households reporting primary source of drinking water at the time of data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reportedly having enough water for drinking, cooking, bathing and washing at the time of data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has not enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an unimproved drinking water source AND has not enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an unimproved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH has not enough water to meet other needs (cooking, bathing/washing or other purposes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>None/minimal (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source and has enough drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source and has enough drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>HH has not enough water to meet other needs (cooking, bathing/washing or other purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None/minimal (1)</td>
<td>HH is using an improved drinking water source and has enough drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, sanitation &amp; hygiene (WASH)</td>
<td>% of households reporting primary source of drinking water at the time of data collection, by drinking water source</td>
<td>HH is using an unimproved drinking water source AND has not enough drinking water OR HH is using an unimproved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water OR HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has not enough drinking water AND HH has not enough water to meet other needs (cooking, bathing/washing or other purposes) OR &amp; HH is using an improved drinking water source AND has enough drinking water AND HH is using an improved sanitation facility</td>
<td>HH is using an improved sanitation facility AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reportedly having enough water for drinking, cooking, bathing and washing at the time of data collection</td>
<td>None (open defecation)</td>
<td>HH is using an improved sanitation facility (other than open defecation) OR HH is using an improved sanitation facility AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting primary sanitation facility at the time of data collection, by type of sanitation facility</td>
<td>% of households reporting primary sanitation facility at the time of data collection, by type of sanitation facility</td>
<td>None of the cases on the left AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting having soap at the time of data collection</td>
<td>No soap available</td>
<td>Soap available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting main problems related to access to latrines for male and female household members at the time of data collection, by type of problem</td>
<td>Any of the following: • Not enough latrines/long waiting times/overcrowding • Persons with disabilities have problems accessing/using latrines • Older persons have problems accessing/using latrines • Females feel unsafe using latrines, because they are not (appropriately) segregated between men and women • Females feel unsafe using latrines because walls/doors are see-through • Females feel unsafe using latrines because there is no lock</td>
<td>None of the cases on the left AND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Females are not able or allowed to leave the shelter to access the latrines&lt;br&gt;- Females feel unsafe accessing or using latrines out of fear of harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any of the following:&lt;br&gt;- Lack of bathing facilities/long queues/overcrowded&lt;br&gt;- Persons with disabilities have problems accessing/using bathing facilities&lt;br&gt;- Older persons have problems accessing/using bathing facilities&lt;br&gt;- Females feel unsafe using bathing facilities, because they are not (appropriately) segregated between men and women&lt;br&gt;- Females feel unsafe using bathing facilities because walls/doors are see-through&lt;br&gt;- Females feel unsafe using bathing facilities because they cannot lock the cubicles&lt;br&gt;- Females are not able or allowed to leave the shelter to access the shared bathing facilities&lt;br&gt;- Females feel unsafe using bathing facilities out of fear of harassment&lt;br&gt;- Shared bathing facility is available but females prefer not to use it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, sanitation &amp; hygiene (WASH)</td>
<td>% of households reporting main problems related to bathing facility access for male and female household members at the time of data collection, by type of problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>&gt;80% of children in the household were enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>&gt;40% of children in the household were enrolled OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td>&gt;40% of children in the household accessed home-based learning AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td>&gt;40% of children in the household accessed home-based learning AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None/minimal (1)</td>
<td>&gt;80% of children in the household accessed home-based learning AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-COVID enrolment in learning facilities of children aged 4 - 24</td>
<td>&lt;40% of children in the household were enrolled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=40% of children in the household were enrolled AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to home-based learning of children aged 3-24 since the start of the 2021 school year and until home-based learning support was stopped at the end of March 2021</td>
<td>&lt;40% of children in the household accessed home-based learning OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=40% of children in the household accessed home-based learning AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=80% of children in the household accessed home-based learning AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children aged 3-24 that have returned or will be sent back to learning facilities once they will re-open</td>
<td>If at least one child up to the age of 18 will not be sent back (while all children &gt; 18 will be sent back/no children &gt; 18) AND marriage/pregnancy reported as reason for not sending back</td>
<td>If at least one child up to the age of 18 will not be sent back (while all children &gt; 18 will be sent back/no children &gt; 18) AND work outside the household reported as reason for not sending back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=40% of children in the household will be sent back / have been sent back</td>
<td>&gt;=40% of children in the household will be sent back / have been sent back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If at least one child up to the age of 18 has not accessed home-based learning (while all children &gt; 18 have/no children &gt; 18) AND marriage/pregnancy reported as barrier OR • If at least one child up to the age of 18 has not accessed home-based learning (while all children &gt; 18 have/no children &gt; 18) AND work outside the household reported as barrier</td>
<td>4-5 major barriers reported¹ OR &lt;=3 major barriers reported AND No/only minor barriers reported/only 1 major barrier reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Reported barriers towards benefiting from home-based learning for boys/girls aged 3-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If at least one child up to the age of 18 will be sent back (while all children &gt; 18 won't/no children &gt; 18) AND marriage/pregnancy reported as challenge OR • If at least one child up to the age of 18 will be sent back (while all children &gt; 18 won't/no children &gt; 18) AND work outside the household reported as challenge</td>
<td>4-5 major expected challenges reported²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported expected challenges once boys/girls aged 3-24 will return to learning facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households without children aged 3-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Any barriers with the exception of the following were considered major: no space for children to study in shelter; lack of light in shelter; children cannot concentrate at home.

² Any expected challenges with the exception of the following were considered major: security concerns of child travelling or being at learning facility; learning facilities overcrowded; children lack documentation needed to register; lack of Rohingya teaching staff.
### Annex 2: Critical Indicators Feeding into LSGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Unmet Needs</th>
<th>No Unmet Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>None/minimal (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households with a separated child</td>
<td>At least one separated child AND reason is marriage OR violence OR</td>
<td>No separated child in the household AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of boys/girls (&lt;18 years) in early marriage, at the time of data collection</td>
<td>At least one child married OR</td>
<td>No married child in the household AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households reporting children working in the 30 days prior to data collection</td>
<td>Children working outside the home reported as barrier towards accessing education for children aged 18 and below OR</td>
<td>No children working AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least one child working OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households reporting children working long hours (&gt;43 hours/week) or in hazardous conditions in the 30 days prior to data collection</td>
<td>At least one child working long hours or in hazardous conditions (or strategy exhausted)</td>
<td>No children working long hours/in hazardous conditions AND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 2: CRITICAL INDICATORS FEEDING INTO LSGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
<td>Severe (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households reporting members of their community wanting to report a safety or security incident, or to access protection services for any other reason not able to report the incident or access the services they needed in the 12 months prior to data collection</td>
<td>Community members were not able to report/access services despite needing to</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households reporting members of their community having reported safety or security incidents, or accessed protection services for any other reason, having faced barriers when doing so in the 12 months prior to data collection, by type of barrier</td>
<td>Faced any of the following challenges:</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service/staff was not available because of COVID-19</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not know where to report</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Persons with disabilities faced challenges reporting/accessing protection services, or were not able to AND persons with disabilities in household</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Elderly persons faced challenges reporting/accessing protection services, or were not able to AND older persons in household</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Females faced challenges reporting/accessing protection services, or were not able to AND females in household</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of respondents reporting that the needs of children in their community are being met to ensure their well-being, at the time of data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households reporting areas which women and girls in the community avoid areas because they feel unsafe there, at the time of data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>% of households with children aged 6-59 months reportedly having been screened for malnutrition, since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households with referred or already enrolled children reportedly not having received nutrition support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households with a referred or enrolled child reportedly not having taken the child to a nutrition facility, hospital or stabilization centre or not having received support reporting reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNMET NEEDS

**Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)**

- Any of the following (AND children in the household):
  - Safety and security
  - Food
  - Shelter
  - Alternative care
  - Health care

**Extreme (4)**

- None of the following (AND children in the household):
  - Safety and security
  - Food
  - Shelter
  - Alternative care
  - Health care

**Severe (3)**

- None of the following (AND children in the household):
  - Safety and security
  - Food
  - Shelter
  - Alternative care
  - Health care

**Stress (2)**

- None of the following (AND children in the household):
  - Safety and security
  - Food
  - Shelter
  - Alternative care
  - Health care

### NO UNMET NEEDS

**None/minimal (1)**

- None of the unmet needs on the left (OR no children in the household) AND

### Protection

- None of the areas on the left reported (OR specific population groups not in household)

### Nutrition

- All children were screened AND

- All referred/enrolled children received support OR did not meet admission criteria OR are enrolled and waiting for distribution day AND

- At least one child has not been screened
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme+ (4+, potentially life-threatening)</td>
<td>Extreme (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of households with children aged 6-59 months reportedly having accessed nutrition services since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021), by type of contact</td>
<td>Household did not receive blanket supplementary feeding</td>
<td>Household received blanket supplementary feeding OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Households without children aged 6-59 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>% of households by reported travel time to the nearest, functional health facility by normal mode of transportation</td>
<td>At least one person not accessing health care (at health facility) when they needed to in the past 3 months</td>
<td>All persons needing treatment accessed health care (at health facility) when they needed to in the past 3 months (or no treatment needed) AND Travel time to primary healthcare facility &gt;= 20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of (households with) individuals with an unmet health care need in the 3 months prior to data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 3: NON-CRITICAL INDICATORS FEEDING INTO LSGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shelter & NFi | % of households reportedly not having made shelter improvements in the 6 months prior to data collection reporting reason, by reason | Any response, indicating that there was a need to improve but no improvements made:  
- Did not receive any shelter support from humanitarian organization  
- Received materials but sold them to cover other needs  
- No money to pay for materials  
- Good quality materials are too expensive  
- Materials are unavailable  
- Quality materials are unavailable  
- No money to pay for labor  
- No able-bodied household member available to make repairs  
- Don't know how to improve the shelter  
- Don't know where to buy materials  
- Don't know who to ask for support  
Reason for not improving is "No need to improve" OR household made improvements |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Shelter & NFi | % of households currently reportedly having access to household NFIs       | No access to at least one of the following:  
- Blankets  
- Mattresses / sleeping mats OR Bedding items  
- Torches/handheld lights AND batteries (OR solar lamps/panels)  
- Clothing OR winter clothing  
- Mosquito nets  
Access to all types of NFIs, or only no access to the following:  
- Kitchen sets  
- Shoes  
- Fans |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Shelter & NFi | % of households having received LPG refills from humanitarian organizations reporting that refills always lasted until the next distribution throughout the 3 months prior to data collection | Did not receive LPG from humanitarian organization or the received LPG did not always last the full cycle  
Received LPG and it always lasted the full cycle |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| WASH          | % of households reporting main problems related to sanitation facility access for male and female household members at the time of data collection, by type of problem | Any of the following:  
- Latrines are not functioning (e.g. full of sludge, lack of water, door/floor/wall/roof in poor condition, lock, latrine exposed to landslide risk, septic tank open or leaking, etc.)  
- Latrines are too far  
- Latrines are difficult to reach (due to road conditions, terrain, etc.)  
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way/at facility  
- Other safety or security concerns on the way/at facility  
Only the following:  
- No problem related to latrines  
- Latrines are unclean/unhygienic  
- No menstrual hygiene management facilities available at latrines  
- Lack of light inside latrines  
- Lack of light outside latrines |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WASH   | % of households reporting main problems related to bathing facility access for male and female household members at the time of data collection, by type of problem | Any of the following:  
- Bathing facilities are not functioning (e.g., lack of water, door/floor/wall in poor conditions, lack of lock, bathing facility exposed to landslide risk, etc.)  
- Bathing facilities are too far  
- Bathing facilities are difficult to reach (due to road conditions, terrain, etc.)  
- Shared bathing facility is available but females prefer not to use it  
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way/at facility  
- Other safety or security concerns on the way/at facility | Only the following:  
- No problems related to bathing facilities  
- Bathing facilities are unclean/unhygienic  
- No menstrual hygiene management facilities available at bathing facilities  
- Lack of light inside bathing facilities  
- Lack of light outside bathing facilities |
| WASH   | % of households reportedly accessing an operating solid waste management system at the time of data collection | Any of the following:  
- Household has only 1 bin at household  
- Household has more than 1 bin at household AND uses bins at household but does not segregate  
- Household has access to communal bin/pit AND uses communal bin/pit but does not segregate  
- Household does not have access to bin at household or communal bin/pit  
- Household throws waste behind shelter/in the drain | Only the following:  
- Household has access to more than 1 bin at household AND uses bins at household and segregates  
- Household has access to communal bin/pit AND uses communal bin/pit and segregates  
- Household uses food waste to produce own compost |
| Protection | % of households reporting a deterioration in the safety and security situation in the year prior to data collection | The following:  
- The safety and security situation has gotten worse | The following:  
- The safety and security situation has improved  
- The safety and security situation has not changed |
| Protection | % of households reporting members of their community having reported safety or security incidents, or accessed protection services for any other reason, having faced barriers when doing so in the 12 months prior to data collection, by type of barrier | At least 1 of the following:  
- Problem was not resolved to household’s satisfaction  
- Do not understand the process  
- Lack of privacy at facility/overcrowding  
- Inaccessibility (e.g., due to road conditions)  
- Service is too far away  
- Security concerns travelling to facility/at facility  
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way/at facility  
- Language issues/barriers  
- Service was not effective in the past, so did not try  
- Lack of female staff  
- Other | Did not face any issue (or did not have to report) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protection | % of households reporting areas where women and girls in the community feel unsafe, at the time of data collection | At least 1 area reported:  
- Markets  
- Social/community areas  
- Friend's/relative’s home  
- Community kitchen  
- Nearby forests/open spaces or farms  
- On their way to different facilities  
- In transportation  
- On the way to collect firewood  
- Other | There are no areas where they feel unsafe |
| Protection | % of households reporting areas where boys and men in the community feel unsafe, at the time of data collection | At least 1 area reported:  
- Markets  
- Social/community areas  
- Friend's/relative’s home  
- Community kitchen  
- Nearby forests/open spaces or farms  
- On their way to different facilities  
- In transportation  
- On the way to collect firewood  
- Other | |
| Protection | % of respondents reporting that the needs of children in their community are being met to ensure their well-being, at the time of data collection | At least 1 unmet need:  
- Psychosocial support  
- Education  
- Child protection case management/social work support  
- Safe area for playing  
- Other | All needs of children are met |
| Protection | % of households reporting to which service point they would refer a friend to who had been sexually assaulted, by service point | Only the following:  
- Majhi  
- CiC  
- Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms (e.g. local authorities, elderly citizens, chief traditional leaders)  
- Law enforcement officials (i.e. police)  
- Legal aid service providers  
- Other  
- Nowhere | At least one of the following:  
- Health facilities  
- Psychosocial service providers (community or counseling centers)  
- Ombudsman/National Human Rights Institutions  
- Women-friendly spaces/multi-purpose women centers  
- Family/relatives/guardians, curator or legal authorized representative |
| Nutrition | % of households with a referred or enrolled child reportedly having received support for treatment of malnutrition since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021) reporting barriers, by type of barrier | At least 1 barrier reported:  
- Fear of contracting COVID-19  
- Household is in quarantine  
- Movement restrictions  
- Female caregiver cannot take child to facility by herself and no one is available to accompany her  
- No one available in the household to take the child  
- Household does not believe that child is malnourished and needs treatment  
- Household does not believe that the treatment provided in the facility will cure the child  
- Household does not trust the recommendations of the community nutrition volunteers/ nutrition facility staff  
- Household does not trust the available nutrition services in camps |  
- Did not face any issues when visiting the facility / did not visit facility  
- Household has no children aged 6-59 months |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>% of households with children aged 6-59 months reportedly having accessed nutrition services since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021), by type of contact</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>At least one of the following forms of contact (non-critical):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff provided messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff provided messages related to the mother-led MUAC programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mother or caregiver screened at least one of the children for malnutrition by themselves at the household, using MUAC tape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The household received blanket supplementary feeding supplies for at least one child (WSB++/Suji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff screened at least one child, using MUAC tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The household received supplementary feeding supplies (RUSF/Pushti) for at least one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The household having received therapeutic feeding supplies (RUTF/Pushti) for at least one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR household has no children aged 6-59 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least one of the following forms of contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff provided messages related to basic food and nutrition, infant and young child-feeding practices, malnutrition, personal hygiene, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At least one PLW received supplementary feeding supplies (WSB++/Suji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteers or nutrition facility staff screened at least one PLW either at household or at nutrition facilities, either using MUAC tape or by checking ANC/PNC (antenatal care/post-natal care) if they are currently in a program or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>% of households with PLW reportedly having accessed nutrition services during the current pregnancy or while breastfeeding, by type of contact</td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>At least one of the following forms of contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community nutrition volunteer or nutrition facility staff referred at least one PLW to the nutrition facility for treatment of malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Referred PLW were admitted at the nutrition facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At least one PLW in this household received iron and folic acid tablets from the nutrition facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR household has no PLW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>% of households with PLW reportedly having received iron and folic acid tablets during the current pregnancy or while breastfeeding</td>
<td>At least one PLW did not receive iron and folic acid tablets</td>
<td>All PLW received iron and folic acid tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR household has no PLW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>% of households with adolescent girls (aged 10-19 years) reportedly having received iron and folic acid tablets since the start of Ramadan (14 April 2021)</td>
<td>At least one adolescent girl did not receive iron and folic acid tablets</td>
<td>All adolescent girls received iron and folic acid tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR household has no adolescent girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>% of households by self-reported barriers to accessing health care in the 3 months prior to data collection</td>
<td>At least 2 of the following reported:</td>
<td>Only 1 of the ones on the left, or only the following reported:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No functional health facility nearby</td>
<td>• No challenges accessing health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Could not afford cost of consultation/treatment</td>
<td>• Don’t know where/how to access services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disability prevents access to health facility</td>
<td>• Specific medicine, treatment or service needed unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety/security concerns at health facility</td>
<td>• Long waiting time for the service/overcrowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear or distrust of health workers, examination or treatment</td>
<td>• Health services are too far away/lack of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Language barriers or issues at health facility</td>
<td>• Inaccessibility (e.g. due to road conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Older persons face difficulties accessing health facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety concerns on the way to facilities (during the day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety/security concerns at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of transport at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Health facility not open 24 hours/at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not permitted to go by relative/other household member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Did not receive correct medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor quality consultations at facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not enough staff at health facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wanted to wait and see if problem got better on its own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Could not take time off work / from caring for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of contracting COVID-19 at the health center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 3: NON-CRITICAL INDICATORS FEEDING INTO LSGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNMET NEEDS</th>
<th>NO UNMET NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>% of (households with) children under the age of 2 that were born at a health facility</td>
<td>The following: • At home</td>
<td>One of the following: • NGO clinic • Government clinic • Private clinic • Maternity ward • Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way
- No female staff at health facility
- No gender segregation at health facility
- Other
Please note the findings of Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (J-MSNA) provide information and insights as of the time of data collection. However, in a dynamic setting, as is the case in a humanitarian response, the situation may change. Interventions and aid distribution may be increased or reduced, and this can change the context of the data collected between the MSNA and the situation at the present time.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the MSNA TWG and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of UNHCR.

This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the MSNA TWG and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of IOM.