

WASH: Comprehensive Child Focused Assessment (CCFA) Azrag Camp, February 2017

Context

In collaboration with UNICEF, REACH conducted a Comprehensive Child Focused Assessment (CCFA) between January and February 2017 in Azrag camp. This evaluated the needs of children¹ and their families across multiple sectors: WASH, Education, Health, Child Protection and Youth. The CCFA aimed at informing 2017 programming and advocacy in Azrag camp² for UNICEF and other camp actors, by assessing the demographic profile of the camp, as well as analysing the current UNICEF service coverage and equity of access. It also provided an updated needs analysis for children in the camp and identified trends in needs and service provision for Villages 3 and 6, by triangulating findings with the 2015 CCFA.3 The information provided in this factsheet is part of a wider assessment report.4

The present factsheet provides key findings regarding WASH service uptake, and needs of children and their families in Azrag Camp, gathered at the household level.5

- ¹ Children are defined here as individuals aged 0 to 17 years. ² This includes all inhabited villages: two (2), three (3), five (5), and six (6). For the remainder of this factsheet
- village numbers will be represented as digits. ³ The first CCFA in Azraq was conducted in 2015. At that time only Villages 3 and 6 were inhabited.

Methodology

Data collection was conducted between 22 January 2017 and 23 February 2017 in Villages 2, 3, 5, and 6. A total of 55 Incentive Based Volunteers (IBV)⁶ (18 females and 37 males), divided in six mixed sex teams, were engaged for the assessment. Each team was supervised by one REACH enumerator. Every household⁷ in the camp was visited; following the first visit, enumerators returned to unassessed households a maximum of two additional times. A total of 7,205 houses were assessed, covering 6,728 cases and a total population of 32,510 individuals (19,780 are aged 0 to 17 years).

⁶ The IBV scheme established in Azraq camp by UNHCR and partners provides refugees living in the camp with an opportunity to engage in support roles across a variety of sectors in exchange for remuneration 7A 'household' is defined as either a single or a collection of shelters inhabited by a UNHCR registered case or by multiple UNHCR registered cases who share resources.

Usage of Public WASH Blocks

Reported usage of public WASH blocks during the day, by sex and age:

Girls (0-17y)	4%	96%	
Boys (0-17y)	5%	95%	
Women (18+y)	{ 1%	99%	
Men (18+y)	0.4%	99.6%	
Using the WAS purpose, during	H block for at least 1 the day	Not using the WASH block for any purpose, during the day	

In Villages 3 and 6 in 2015, usage of public WASH blocks was above 99% for all demographics during the day.

Non-usage during the day and night

Reported non-usage of public WASH blocks during the day and the night, by sex and age:



For both children and adults, non-usage at night was at least double than reported during the day.

⁴ Comprehensive Child Focused Assessment Report, Azrag 2017.

⁵ All guestions were asked at the household level, but that type and frequency of WASH block usage was asked according to the following demographics: girls under 18, boys under 18, women 18 and over, men 18 and over.

Population Demographics

Total assessed population of Azrag camp⁸, by age group and sex:

Demographic	% Population
Girls aged 0-17 years	29%
Boys aged 0-17 years	32%
Women aged 18+ years	21%
Men aged 18+ years	18%

The child population constituted the majority of the camp with 61% under 18 years of age; the adult population (18+ years) represented 39% of the total population.

Type of Public WASH Block Usage

Reported purpose for which WASH centre was used during the day, by sex and age:

Demographic	Toilet	Bathing	Ablutions	Washing clothes	Washing dishes
Girls (0-17y)	96%	8%	1%	2%	1%
Boys (0-17y)	95%	9%	1%	1%	0%
Women (18+y)	99%	8%	1%	3%	2%
Men (18+y)	99%	11%	3%	0%	0%

Low reported usage of WASH blocks for bathing implies that residents may have found private sources for showering and/or bathing.

Usage of public WASH block for bathing

Reported usage of public WASH blocks for bathing during the day in Villages 3 and 6, by year:



Reported usage of WASH blocks for bathing has decreased considerably since 2015, suggesting a rise in use of private, ad hoc, washing facilities.

REAC

An initiative of

IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and UNOSAT

⁸ Each shelter was visited up to three times, however residents of 999 shelters were not interviewed. Households may not have been assessed for the following reasons: the shelter was unoccupied or no sign of people living in it (64%), no-one over the age of 18 was available (34%), or the residents declined the interview (2%)



Drinking Water Source

Households' reported primary source of drinking water:

Public water point	97%	
Bottled water	3%	1

Reported usage of public water points as the primary source of drinking water was consistent across all villages. The majority of households that reported using bottled water as their main source of drinking water reported that they did so to avoid supposed health risks associated with perceived 'poor quality of drinking water'.

Water Quantity Satisfaction

Perceived sufficiency of quantity of drinking water to meet needs, per percentage of households:

Very sufficient	19%	
Sufficient	63%	
Neutral	12%	
Insufficient	5%	
Very insufficient	1%	

Although perceived sufficiency was high at the camp level, there was considerable variation at the village level: 94% of households in Village 5 reported the quantity to be sufficient/ very sufficient, compared to 77% in Village 6 and 74% in Village 3.

As the public water taps are a centralized system, there is no real control over individual use, while access to water is mostly restricted by tap stand numbers, water distribution times and network pressure.

Water quantity satisfaction over time

Perceived sufficiency of quantity of drinking water to meet needs, per percentage of households in Villages 3 and 6:

2015

Very sufficient/ Sufficient	72%	
Neutral	22%	
Very insufficient/ Insufficient	6%	
2017		
Very sufficient/ Sufficient	75%	
Neutral	17%	
Very insufficient/ Insufficient	8%	

Across Villages 3 and 6, perceived sufficiency of quantity of drinking water to meet needs has increased by 3 percentage points. However, the proportion of households that reported quantity as insufficient/ very insufficient has also increased slightly: by 2 percentage points.



Proportion of households that reported public water points as their primary source of drinking water in Villages 3 and 6, by year:



Water Accessibility Satisfaction

Reported level of satisfaction with distance to nearest public tap stand, per percentage of households:

Very satisfied	10%	
Satisfied	38%	
Neutral	9%	
Unsatisfied	26%	
Very unsatisfied	17%	

Of the 43% of households at the camp level that reported to be unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with the distance to tap stands, 98% reported that it was too far to walk.

Reported satisfaction varied at the village level: 65% of households in Village 5 reported being satisfied/very satisfied, compared to 39% in Village 6 and 38% in Village 3. However, although lower than in Villages 2 and 5, reported satisfaction has increased in Villages 3 and 6 since 2015.

Water accessibility satisfaction over time

Reported level of satisfaction with distance to nearest public tap stand, per percentage of households in Villages 3 and 6:

2015 Very satisfied/ 27% Satisfied 24% Neutral Very unsatisfied/ Unsatisfied 49% 2017 Very satisfied/ 38% Satisfied 12% Neutral Very satisfied/ 50% Unsatisfied

Since 2015, reported satisfaction with distance to tap stands has increased in Villages 3 and 6, although reported disatisfaction has remained relatively consistent. The proportion of households that reported a neutral attitude decreased, indicating a polarization of opinion.

REACH IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and UNOSAT

