

SYRIAN REFUGEES STAYING IN INFORMAL TENTED SETTLEMENTS IN JORDAN

MULTI-SECTOR ASSESSMENT REPORT

AUGUST 2014





SUMMARY

As the Syrian crisis enters its fourth year and shows no signs of abating, the ever-increasing number of Syrians seeking refuge in neighbouring countries has consistently outpaced the mobilisation of humanitarian support. In Jordan alone, the total number refugees is 607,500¹ between December 2013 and July 2014. For Syrian refugees who are unable or unwilling to reside in formally established refugee camps and are unable to afford regular housing solutions within host communities, **Informal Tented Settlements (ITS) have become the default option, notably for the most vulnerable and impoverished displaced Syrian households**.

The informal nature of these settlements means that access to shelter, food, water, sanitation, health, education, and other essential services is not officially established and often intermittent. Falling outside the relief response currently targeting refugees staying in managed camps and within host communities, **displaced Syrian** households living in ITS face serious difficulties in accessing protection and assistance. Due to recent ITS evictions in late June 2014, these protection concerns have heightened².

In June 2014, REACH conducted a third multi-sector assessment of Syrian refugees in ITS commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In December 2013 and May 2014, REACH conducted prior ITS assessments, also in partnership with UNICEF,³ spanning the sectors of livelihoods, shelter, food security, health, education, and water and sanitation. The findings from this third assessment provide an updated overview of the main vulnerabilities, needs and coping mechanisms of Syrian refugees residing in ITS across the governorates of Al Aqaba, Al Mafraq, Amman, Irbid, Maan and Zarqa⁴.

- Between December 2013 and July 2014, REACH identified an increased ITS population (320.8%), partly due to increased geographical coverage compared to past assessments⁵, as well as evidence pointing to an increase in ITS settlements overall in Jordan. Overall, this assessment covered a total of **125 informal** settlements representing a four-fold increase in the number of settlements identified to date.
- The vast majority (78%) of Syrian refugees in ITS were minors (8,219 individuals below 18 years old) and a third (32.4%) were children under the age of 12 (3,414 individuals).
- REACH calculated an average dependency ratio of 1.5, a 0.9 point increase from May 2014 (0.6), indicating an exponential growth in the number of dependents in assessed ITS. This may be attributable to the influx of new arrivals who are comprised primarily of minors. It is probable that new households which previously resided in host communities had comparatively higher dependency ratios, were more vulnerable, had depleted already scarce resources and were compelled to move into ITS.
- Only 3.5% of the school-aged ITS population was reported as attending school at the time of the assessment,. The primary barrier to access education was lack of funds (39.8%), despite the fact that schooling is subsidised for Syrian refugees in Jordan. 41.4% of all school-aged children residing in ITS had never been enrolled in formal education either in Jordan or in Syria, indicating a high rate of ineligibility⁶ for formal education especially for children over 12. A total of 1,490 children (759 males and 731 females aged 12-17) are ineligible, whilst fewer are likely to be ineligible under this age threshold. Another key finding which impacts education is that 21.3% of all school-aged children were reported as working.



¹ UNHCR refugee population data, found at: <u>http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=107</u>

² A total of 5 long-term settlements were evicted from Amman southern districts in late June 2014. Data collected on these settlements has not been removed from the composite dataset and is, as such, part of the analysis. However, the ITS Eviction profiles for these settlements are attached to Annex 2. ³ A Multi-sector, Baseline Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH/UNICEF; A Multi-sector Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, June 2014, REACH/UNICEF.

⁴ The site verification exercise conducted prior to the survey showed that these governorates hosted the highest number of ITS. REACH field teams conducted comprehensive site verification exercises across all twelve governorates of Jordan and found ITS in these six.

⁵ Please refer to summary table at the end of this section.

⁶ Ineligibility defined as missed more than 3 years of schooling.

- A quarter (25%) of at-risk minors aged 0-59 months were reported by heads of households as not vaccinated against polio by heads of households⁷. This is a critical health risk for Syrian refugee children, given the recent reports of polio outbreaks within Syria⁸, despite the regional polio vaccination campaign subsequently carried out.
- Water and sanitation infrastructure and service provision was found to be severely inadequate across all assessed settlements. A total of 23 ITS hosting a total of 784 people had no access to either private or communal latrine infrastructure within the settlement. The vast majority (70.6%) of assessed households reported no access to either communal or private sanitation systems. In regards to access to water, over half (56.6%) reported private vendors as their primary source of cooking, drinking and washing water.⁹
- Food insecurity remains widespread across all ITS. A high proportion (78.2%) of assessed households identified WFP assistance as the primary source of food. Findings indicate that 22.7% of households had a borderline Food Consumption Score (FCS)¹⁰, and an additional 10% had a poor FCS. This represents a 53.1% decrease in the proportion of households who fell below the acceptable threshold. Over a third (38.7%) of households were identified as vulnerable to food insecurity, whilst a fifth (20.3%) were food insecure.
- Livelihoods have substantially improved among ITS populations, most likely due to the on-going harvest in northern Jordan and the associated increase in incomes. On average, earned income was 112 JOD per household in the 30 days prior to the survey, whilst the average debt-to-income ratio was 5.5:1, with substantial variation by governorate. This is a 42 JOD/month increase in average household incomes and a 2.5 point decrease in the debt-income ratio from May 2014. Agricultural waged labour was the reported primary source of income.

Despite improvements in some sectors, Syrian refugees living in ITS in Jordan continue to be one of the most vulnerable group among refugee populations affected by the Syria crisis. Based on the assessment findings, REACH developed the following **recommended priority interventions**:

Overall, this assessment has enabled REACH to compile a comprehensive dataset on the vulnerabilities, needs and service gaps faced by Syrian populations currently living in ITS with the aim to inform settlement-level targeted planning of assistance. Sector-based needs of refugee populations remain highly context and settlement-specific and should evictions continue, protection concerns are likely to become heightened.

⁷ Although it is difficult to verify the veracity of this response given that refugee households residing in ITS have very poor knowledge of health issues and no official medical record was kept of such vaccinations. In the mean-time, two vaccination campaigns targeting hard to reach areas such as ITS have taken place.

⁸ World Health Organisation: http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2013/polio-syria-20131113/en/

⁹ Anecdotal evidence suggests that ITS residents do not, or may not have the resources to, distinguish between drinking and cooking/washing water.
¹⁰ The FCS is a composite score based on dietary diversity, frequency of consumption and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. Food items are grouped into 8 standard food groups with a maximum value of 7 days per week. The consumption frequency of each food group is multiplied by an assigned weight that is based on its nutritional content. In order to ensure data quality, enumerators were trained to ask this question to the most senior female member of household who, for cultural reasons, is more likely to be familiar with dietary diversity and food consumption patterns in the household.

CONTENTS

| SUMMARY | 1 |
|--|------|
| Abbreviations and acronyms | 4 |
| Geographical classifications | 4 |
| ist of table, maps and figures | 4 |
| NTRODUCTION | 6 |
| NETHODOLOGY | 7 |
| Defining Informal Tented Settlements | 7 |
| Data collection and analysis | 7 |
| Challenges and Limitations | 8 |
| FINDINGS | 9 |
| Demographics | 9 |
| Education | .13 |
| Food Security | .15 |
| HEALTH | .19 |
| LIVELIHOODS | .22 |
| Shelter | .29 |
| WATER AND SANITATION | . 30 |
| CONCLUSION | .34 |
| ANNEXES | .36 |
| ANNEX 1: ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE | .36 |
| ANNEX 2: EVICTION PROFILES [NEXT PAGE] | 5 |
| ANNEX 3: ITS LOCATION MAP | 7 |

About REACH

REACH is a joint initiative of two international non-governmental organizations - ACTED and IMPACT Initiatives and the UN Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT). REACH works to strengthen evidencebased decision making by aid actors through efficient data collection, management and analysis before, during and after an emergency. By doing so, REACH contributes to ensuring that communities affected by emergencies receive the support they need. All REACH activities are conducted in support to and within the framework of inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms.

For more information about REACH and to access our information products, please visit: <u>www.reach-initiative.org</u>. You can also write to us at: <u>jordan@reach-initiative.org</u> and follow us @REACH_info.



Abbreviations and acronyms

| FCS | Food Consumption Score |
|--------|--------------------------------|
| IFE | Informal Education |
| ITS | Informal Tented Settlement |
| NFE | Non-formal Education |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| RRP6 | Regional Response Plan 6 |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| WFP | World Food Programme |

Geographical classifications

| Governorate | The highest administrative boundary below the national level. Jordan has 12 governorates. |
|--------------|---|
| District | Governorates are divided into sub-districts. There are 51 districts in Jordan. |
| Sub-district | Districts are sub-divided into sub-districts, of which there are 89 in Jordan. |

List of table, maps and figures

| Table 1: ITS summary table by date of assessment | 3 9 10 15 22 |
|---|--------------------------|
| Map 1: Growth in assessed ITS population (May-June 2014) Map 2: Proportion (%) of food insecure households (May-July 2014) Map 3: Proportion (%) of children aged 0-59 months reported as vaccinated against polio Map 4: Average reported household income by governorate (30 days) | |
| Map 5: Average household debt loan by governorate | 31 |
| Figure 1: Proportion (%) of children under 18 and children under 12 relative to total ITS population by governorate | 111 |
| Figure 3: Primary reported reasons for non-attendance by governorate and proportion of housholds Figure 4: Proportion of school aged children reported as attending formal education | |
| Figure 5: Levels of education of heads of households by proportion (%) of households Figure 6: Reported primary sources of food by governorate | 16 176 |
| Figure 7: Proportions of households by food consumption score Figure 8: Proportion (%) of households by food security status | |
| Figure 10: Proportion (%) of children aged 0-59 and 6-59 months vaccinated against polio and measles Figure 11: Reported primary sources of income by governorate | 21 |
| Figure 12: Average number of days worked by head of household in 7 days prior to assessment Figure 13: Demographic distribution displaying total population and total economically active population | |
| Figure 14: Average household debt loads and income by governorate | |

| Figure 16: Average household income and long-term debt load by primary source of income | 29 |
|---|------|
| Figure 17: Primary reasons for accruing debt by governorate | |
| Figure 18: Rates of access to private and/or communal latrines | |
| Figure 19: Primary sources of water by proportion (%) of households | |
| Figure 20: Average water scarcity by primary reported source of water | |
| Figure 21: Type of coping strategy used to overcome water shortages by proportion (%) of households | 3633 |
| | |

INTRODUCTION

As the Syrian crisis enters its fourth year and shows no signs of abating, the increasing number of Syrians seeking refuge and protection in neighbouring countries has consistently outpaced the mobilisation of humanitarian support. For Syrian refugees who are either unable or unwilling to reside in formally established refugee camps and are unable to afford regular housing solutions within host communities, informal tented settlements (ITS) have become the default option, notably for the most vulnerable displaced Syrian households.

The informal nature of these settlements means that access to shelter, food, water, sanitation, health, education, and other essential services is not officially established. Falling outside the relief response currently targeting refugees staying in managed camps and within host communities, displaced Syrian households in ITS are facing serious difficulties to access the protection and assistance they need.

In June 2014, REACH conducted a multi-sector assessment of Syrian refugee households in ITS commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). In December 2013 and April 2014, REACH had previously conducted ITS assessments also in partnership with UNICEF¹¹. The findings from this third assessment provide an updated overview of the main vulnerabilities, needs and coping mechanisms of Syrian refugees residing in ITS across the governorates of AI Aqaba, AI Mafraq, Amman, Irbid, Maan and Zarqa¹² and enable a comprehensive time-series analysis of findings across the three assessments.

This report present the methodology applied by REACH for this assessment, followed by a detailed presentation of findings on the assessed population demographics, education, food security, health, livelihoods, shelter, water and sanitation. Despite improvements in some sectors, Syrian refugees living in ITS in Jordan continue to be one of the most vulnerable group among refugee populations affected by the Syria crisis. It is urgent that aid actors continue to monitor the situation in ITS, which should be prioritized in the ongoing refugee response. Based on the assessment findings, REACH developed recommended priority interventions which are outlined in the conclusion.

¹¹ A Multi-sector, Baseline Assessment of Informal Tented Settlements in Jordan, December 2013, REACH.

¹² The site verification exercise conducted prior to the survey showed that these governorates hosted the highest number of ITS. Data on sites across other governorates was not available at the time of the assessment, but REACH's continuous monitoring exercise through key informants indicates that ITS also exist in the governorates of Amman and Zarqa.

METHODOLOGY

Defining Informal Tented Settlements

There is no consensus about what constitutes an "informal settlement" either in policy-making or academic circles. For the purpose of this analysis, REACH used the generic definition published by the UN Habitat Programme: "unplanned settlements and areas where housing is not in compliance with current planning and building regulations". Although useful, it does not address the full spectrum of factors which lead to the establishment of informal settlements within the context of the Syria crisis. In Jordan, ITS are best defined in terms of two inter-related factors: a) settlements size and b) the land tenure pattern, both of which interact to determine welfare and vulnerability across settlements. In Jordan, REACH utilised a standardised settlement size of four households to determine target settlements and this allowed REACH to expand coverage to 125 settlements.

Whilst a cap on settlement size was a necessity in terms of programmatic needs¹³, the definition is best understood in terms of land tenure patterns which are unique to each settlement. Here, effectively, non-existent land and labour rights, the lack of official cost-recovery mechanisms for the utilisation of municipal services as well as minimal social protection under the law mean that settlements are necessarily transient by nature and settlement locations are often determined by the availability of income-generating activities and the availability of access to municipal services. Where either is unavailable or exhausted, settlements may migrate to other areas once residents determine where access can be re-established.

Data collection and analysis

REACH used a two-stage methodology for this assessment. Given how dynamic the migration patterns of settlement residents can be, the first stage of this assessment was a verification and site mapping exercise. This was the methodology which was used in the May 2014 assessment and which proved highly successful; a followup site verification exercise was deemed necessary because of the commencement of the harvest in the northern governorates of Al Mafraq and Zarqa which caused a large-scale migration from the south.

REACH field teams were deployed to areas all of the governorates of Jordan and collected geo-referenced settlement-level information where ITS were identified, recording the number of households and an approximation of the number of people using the Global Positioning System (GPS)-enabled Open Data Kit (ODK) platform. Ultimately, ITS were identified in the governorates of Al Aqaba, Al Mafraq, Amman, Irbid, Maan and Zarqa. The purpose of this exercise was to enable planning by addressing information gaps and reducing the amount of time spent physically searching for settlements through key informants, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and service providers, for example.

Once this verification exercise was completed and ITS location maps were generated, REACH field teams were deployed to these pre-identified sites to conduct a survey of each households in each pre-identified settlement. Each refugee household was requested to answer a comprehensive, multi-sectoral survey designed to allow REACH to develop a dataset on the welfare, needs and vulnerabilities affecting settlement residents and to facilitate future thematic interventions.

Data collection was conducted between 16th June and 2nd July 2014 by mixed sex teams to mitigate any cultural barriers which may have hampered data collection. Overall, a total of 20 enumerators and 4 field coordinators were deployed to conduct data collection, with each team consisting of 5 enumerators and 1 field coordinator. Given that AI Mafraq was closest to REACH field offices and that it hosted the largest number of ITS, data collection began there. Once AI Mafraq was completed, field teams were split between the governorates of Zarqa and Irbid and progressed towards the southern areas of Jordan.

¹³ Smaller settlements are more mobile and therefore more difficult to track and deliver assistance to, hence the regional standard of four households.

For the purpose of this assessment, a household was defined as a set of individuals or families sharing a corresponding set of shelters or a compound. Where appropriate, this was done on a self-defined basis¹⁴. No individual household or household identifiers were collected. This approach ensured households could provide information in confidence, thereby reducing household bias and mitigating any potential protection concerns.

The indicators included in the data collection tools are based on those used in the Syria Regional Response Plan 6 (RRP6), as well as standardised questions and indicators developed by REACH for previous assessments and the ITS Task Force which operated temporarily in early 2014. In order to ensure comparability of data, this questionnaire was also standardised with the previous REACH assessment tool used in December 2013. The data collection tool was also identical to the version used in April 2014, bar several additions in the Education section¹⁵.

The entirety of the data collection was done using ODK mobile data collection platform using smart-phone and GPS-enabled technology to reduce the incidence of inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the data collection and cleaning processes and, wherever possible, semi-structured, ad hoc key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with settlement residents to supplement quantitative data with qualitative insights.

| Governorate | Proportion (%) of minors under 18/governorate | Total number of people/governorate | Total number of ITS/governorate |
|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Al Aqaba | 65.5 | 25 | 1 |
| Al Mafraq | 77.0 | 5756 | 72 |
| Amman | 80.4 | 3540 | 22 |
| Irbid | 73.4 | 163 | 1 |
| Maan | 75.6 | 501 | 16 |
| Zarqa | 77.7 | 553 | 13 |

Table 1: Total of assessed settlements and individuals

Challenges and Limitations

The most significant challenge faced by REACH was imperfect information regarding site locations which occurred during the data collection phase. Despite the site verification exercise which was conducted prior to the household survey, the high mobility of settlement residents meant that several smaller settlements had moved during the seven day period between the two assessments.

What follows from this is the limitation on the validity of the dataset which was collected. Follow-up key informant interviews suggest that three settlements from the southern governorates had migrated to Al Mafraq governorate, meaning that the geospatial analysis presented here needs to be updated. Although the best that can be hoped for in this dynamic context is a snapshot of needs, continuous longitudinal surveys are required to ensure the validity and quality of data.

The second and final limitation is the verification of the veracity of responses to certain questions. One example is that of vaccination rates; given the limited knowledge that ITS residents possess regarding health issues, as well as poor record-keeping, it is difficult to verify whether at-risk minors aged 0-59 months had truly received polio and/or measles vaccinations. Further research is recommended.

¹⁴ This means that where enumerators were unclear, heads of households were requested to delineate household boundaries themselves to ensure that no overlaps occurred during data collection.

¹⁵ This was done at the request of partners from UNICEF. Please see Annex 1 for the amended version of the questionnaire.

FINDINGS

DEMOGRAPHICS

This section outlines data collected on governorate-level ITS as well as the demographic trends which characterise ITS in each assessed governorate. Children comprise the majority of Jordan's ITS population, with the highest proportion of minors found in Amman governorate, and an exponential increase in the proportion of minors was identified between the two assessments. Al Mafraq is also where the highest number of ITS was identified again.

Overall, this assessment covered a total of **125** ITS, **1,853** households and **10,538** individuals, which represents a **50% increase in the total assessed population in comparison to May/June 2014**¹⁶ and a **320.8% increase in comparison to December 2013**¹⁷, again demonstrating the fact that ITS will remain a protracted feature of the Syrian refugee crisis in Jordan. To clarify, the analysis of primary data and longitudinal trends presented in this report only does so **across the assessed ITS population.** The analysis on trends should therefore be interpreted as a comparison between two or more datasets and should not be taken as representative of the ITS population in Jordan as a whole. Fluctuations in findings and outcomes could be attributed to the expanded geographical coverage of the assessment which included Amman governorate.

| | Tot: popul | al assessed Iī ation/governo | TS prate | Proportio 18 | n (%) of mino 8/governorate | rs under | Total number of ITS/governorate | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--|--|
| Governorate | Dec-13 | May-14 | Jul-14 | Dec-13 | May-14 | Jul-14 | Dec-13 | May-14 | Jul-14 | | |
| Ajloun | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0.0% | 53.0% | 0.0% | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Al Aqaba | N/A | N/A | 25 | N/A | 0.0% | 65.5% | N/A | N/A | 1 | | |
| Al Balqa | 1,271 | 1,790 | 0 | 53.2% | 53.4% | 0.0% | 13 | 20 | 0 | | |
| Al Karak | N/A | 85 | 0 | N/A | 60.4% | 0.0% | N/A | 2 | 0 | | |
| Al Mafraq | 1,673 | 4,222 | 5,756 | 53.7% | 56.3% | 77.0% | 15 | 58 | 72 | | |
| Al Tafilah | 0 | N/A | 0 | 0.0% | N/A | 0.0% | 0 | N/A | 0 | | |
| Amman | N/A | N/A | 3,540 | N/A | N/A | 80.4% | N/A | N/A | 22 | | |
| Irbid | 341 | 890 | 163 | 56.8% | 54.2% | 73.4% | 4 | 14 | 1 | | |
| Jarash | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Ma'an | N/A | N/A | 501 | N/A | N/A | 75.6% | N/A | N/A | 16 | | |
| Madaba | N/A | 0 | 0 | N/A | 0.0% | 0.0% | N/A | 0 | 0 | | |
| Zarqa | 0 | 0 | 553 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 77.7% | 0 | 0 | 13 | | |

Table 1: Settlement profiling by governorate and date of assessment

*N/A refers to "Not Assessed", whilst a numeric value refers to a governorate which was covered during the assessment and site-verification exercise but was found to host no ITS.

In addition to the observed increase in the total ITS population, findings indicate a substantial shift in the spatial distribution of Syrian refugees residing in ITS across the twelve governorates of Jordan. For instance, no ITS were identified in the governorates of Al Balqa¹⁸, Ajloun or Al Karak, whilst 11 ITS were identified in Zarqa, 13 in Ma'an, 1 in Al Aqaba and 23 in Amman¹⁹. This migration pattern is largely attributable to the agricultural harvest

¹⁶ Which covered a total of 7,028 individuals across 5 governorates.

¹⁷ The increase in total assessed population can be attributed to two factors in varying degrees: a) expansion of geographic coverage in comparison to previous assessments and b) the influx of new arrivals. This has also undoubtedly impacted the aggregate demographic composition of ITS across Jordan.

¹⁸ In comparison to 20 ITS and 1,790 individuals identified in May/June 2014.

¹⁹ Amman and Ma'an were not covered in the May/June assessment, although key informant data and field work conducted at the time of the assessment suggest that no ITS were present in Ma'an governorate. Whilst it was known that ITS existed in Amman and AI Aqaba, however, resource, information and time constraints prevented REACH from expanding coverage to the areas of South Amman where ITS locations were identified.

which began in Al Mafraq and Zarqa at the end of May 2014 which may have acted as a strong incentive to migrate.

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

Data collected on mobility intentions over the course of April and May 2014 seems to corroborate this; 91.2% of households reported that they intend to leave for either Al Mafraq or Zarqa governorates over the course of the next 1-3 months at the time of the assessment.

The highest number of ITS and ITS residents was again found in Al Mafraq, which has consistently hosted the highest number of ITS since the first round of data collection in December 2013. The close proximity of Al Za'atari refugee camp and the continuous, if intermittent, availability of informal income generating opportunities have most likely contributed to this. Anecdotal evidence suggests that because of the camp's location in Al Mafraq and the limited resources ITS residents have at their disposal upon arrival, settlements in this governorate serve as a cost-effective and geographically convenient location in which to settle in the immediate aftermath of leaving the camp. Furthermore, with the opening of Azraq refugee camp in Zarqa and the commencement of the agricultural harvest in northern Jordan governorate, a large migration of ITS households from the south was observed in the period between the two assessments.



Figure 1: Proportion (%) of children under 18 and children under 12 relative to total ITS population by governorate

Minors under the age of 18 comprise 78% of the total assessed population of Syrian refugees residing in ITS across the six governorates, meaning that the needs of minors should be integrated into any common response strategy. Relative to findings from May 2014, this represents an increase of approximately 50% in the proportion of minors under the age of 18, indicating that the movement into ITS from official camps and/or host communities which most likely preceded this assessment and lead to the expansion in ITS was comprised mostly of minors. Even with the expanded coverage of the present assessment compared to previous, to include additional governorates such as Amman, the Figure 2: Average household dependency ratio by governorate

proportion of children is not high enough in Amman governorate to to account for this sizeable increase in the proportion of minors. Equally, this may mean that vulnerable households residing in formal accommodation in host communities with high rates of dependency may no longer have been able to sustain this shelter option and were compelled to move to ITS as a negative coping mechanism.

This also indicates a high rate of dependency where minors and other vulnerable groups rely on a comparatively much smaller proportion of individuals to facilitate access to basic services such as health, food, water, financial resources and shelter. For instance, the average



■ ITS dependency ratio ■ Host communities dependency ratio



household-level dependency ratio²⁰ across all households is 1.5, again indicating a high rate of dependency.

Map 1: Growth in assessed ITS population (May-June 2014)



²⁰ In economics and demography, the dependency ratio is an age-population ratio of those typically not in the labor force (the dependent part) and those typically in the labor force (the productive part). It is used to measure the pressure on productive population. The dependency ratio for this particular assessment was modeled according to the OECD standard which specifies the economically inactive as individuals between 0-15 years and over 60 years. It was calculated by dividing the total number of dependents by the total number of potentially economically active individuals in each household.

EDUCATION

This section details findings collected on school attendance rates and the reported barriers to attendance. The analysis indicates that the only 3.5% of school-aged children were attending school at the time of the assessment. A significantly higher proportion of school-aged children was reported as working at the time of the assessment than in May 2014.

The assessment revealed strikingly low attendance rates in formal education for school-aged children aged 5-17 residing in ITS across all assessed governorates, with an attendance rate of 3.5% for all households found to host school-aged children. This represents nearly a 13-fold decline in the proportion of school-aged children reported as attending formal education in comparison to May 2014²¹. This may be due to the fact that the commencement of the harvest may have pulled school-aged children out of formal education due to the migration of households to the northern governorates and the increase in employment opportunities; indeed, 25.5% of all school-aged children were found to be working at the time of the assessment, a four-fold increase in the proportion of households reporting child labour in comparison to May 2014.

Despite the fact that 25.5% of all school-aged children were found to be working at the time of the assessment, this is not reflected in the reported reasons for non-attendance. For instance, only 6.9% of household heads reported child labour as the primary reason for non-attendance, whilst **52.9% reported the costs associated with formal schooling as the primary access barrier**. Given that education is heavily subsidised for refugee children, with school books, materials and uniforms provided for free, it appears that perceptions do not reflect reality. Rather, IS residents may be unaware of the fact that education is subsidised, or are referring to associated costs which come with distance (reported by 12.9% of households).

Despite the fact that many settlements are remote and located in often hard-to-traverse landscapes – especially in Al Mafraq – many settlements were also found to be in close proximity to school facilities, meaning that the reported issue of distance as an access barrier does not hold for all. The distance barrier would be most applicable to settlements found in Zarga and Maan governorates.



Figure 3: Primary reported reasons for non-attendance by governorate and proportion (%) of households

²¹ Data collection occurred during the last month of the school term.

Furthermore, **41.4%** of all school-aged children had reportedly never been enrolled in formal education either in Jordan or in Syria, indicating a high rate of ineligibility²² for formal education. A total of 1,490 children (759 males and 731 females aged 12-17) are ineligible, whilst fewer are likely to be ineligible under this age threshold. Those below the age of 12 are at risk of missing more than 3 years of school, will need additional support and will eventually become ineligible for enrolment in formal education. Despite this, only 6.1% of all households reported their children having been out of school for too long to attend as a primary reason. This might be explained by the fact that many households residing in ITS simply do not know that their children are no longer eligible for full-time education.

Table 2: Proportion (%) and number of children reported as never enrolled in formal education

| | Males 5-11 | Females 5-11 | Males 12-17 | Females 12-17 |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Number of school-aged children | 541 | 512 | 759 | 731 |
| Proportion (%) of school-aged children | 50.2% | 47.0% | 35.1% | 33.3% |



Figure 4: Proportion (%) of school-aged children reported as attending formal education

Furthermore, **4.1%** (a total of 268) of school-aged children were found to be attending informal education (IFE) at the time of the assessment. This group of children was identified in the governorates of Al Mafraq, Amman and Irbid; 91.5% of these children were reported as attending IFE in an IFE centre in an ITS. This coincides with observations from the field as well as consultations with partner organisations who confirmed the existence of these IFE centres²³.

Findings indicate that **35.2% of all heads of households had completed no formal education, whilst 52.5%** had only completed primary school, validating the earlier assumption that ITS residents are drawn from the poorest and most vulnerable socioeconomic strata of pre-war Syrian society. The trend also appears to be transferred across generations. With an attendance rate of 3.5% for all school-aged children residing in ITS, the class structure, pre-existing levels of education and the general socioeconomic profile of a household appears to be a key determinant of cross-generational levels of education. Values – the relative importance, or lack thereof, that heads of households place on education – appear to weigh heavily on attendance rates in ITS.

Access does not appear to be a barrier here; in fact, with schooling so heavily subsidised for refugee children, cost is of relatively little importance. Rather, abstract factors such as the value parents place on education, compounded by oft *ad hoc* migration patterns which reduce incentives for enrolment and the need to generate as much income as possible act to deter attendance. Any response or outreach programme which attempts to integrate children residing in ITS into an education system, formal or otherwise, needs to take note of this.



²² Ineligibility defined as missed more than 3 years of schooling.

²³ This refers to Save the Children Jordan as well as UNICEF.



Figure 5: Levels of education of heads of households by proportion (%) of households

FOOD SECURITY

This section presents the analysis of food consumption and food security patterns across assessed governorates. Overall, 32.7% of assessed households had a borderline or poor food consumption score and an analysis of the frequency of consumption of different food groups indicates pervasive micronutrient deficiencies amongst ITS households. Finally, 59% of households were food insecure (20.3%) or vulnerable to food insecurity (38.7%) at the time of the assessment.

Findings indicate a marginal improvement in food security across ITS as a whole, but food again emerged as one of the most acute unmet needs across ITS in Jordan despite the fact that humanitarian assistance in the form of WFP vouchers was accessed by all assessed households.

Overall, **78.2% identified WFP assistance as their primary source of food**, which in turn represents an increase of 15.8% in the proportion of households identifying WFP vouchers as their primary food source in comparison to May 2014. Whilst this may be attributable to the fact that this assessment covered a broader geographical area and a larger target population, it may also be that with the exponential increase in the total ITS population, households who have recently moved into ITS are comparatively more vulnerable than households who have been residing in ITS for a longer period of time.



Figure 6: Reported primary sources of food by governorate

A quarter (24.9%) of households relying primarily on WFP assistance also reported buying food on credit to overcome food shortages for the household in the 30 days prior to the assessment. Equally, 17% of households also reported borrowing food to meet the household's food needs over the seven days prior to the assessment at least once, whilst 8.8% reported doing so seven times in the seven days prior to the assessment. This indicates that despite comprehensive coverage, the assistance provided is either not enough to sustain a household's food requirements or is redirected to income generation.

Food Consumption

Findings indicate that 22.7% of households had a borderline Food Consumption Score²⁴, whilst an additional 10% were classified as poor. This represents a 53.1% decrease in the proportion of households who fell below the acceptable threshold for the frequency of consumption and nutritional intake in comparison to May 2014, indicating a significant improvement in food consumption patterns. However, it is worth noting that the FCS proxy is only based on current consumption and does not account for seasonality or vulnerability to future exogenous shocks which could threaten future consumption patterns, nutritional intake and/or food security status. Indeed, the current improvement in food consumption and nutritional intake could be attributed to the on-going harvest which has perhaps eased access to more high-nutrient food groups. Furthermore, given that migration patterns are often sporadic, household food sources may also shift in tandem and with this, the sustainability of these food sources, the consumption pattern and nutritional intake.



Figure 7: Proportion (%) of households by food consumption score

Of the households with a poor FCS, **98.9% did not consume any fish and seafood over the course of the seven days prior to the assessment. A further 88.2% did not consume animal protein or meat at all, whilst 36.6% did not consume oil and fats. Given the seven-day recall period for this indicator, this food consumption pattern implies the prevalence – or at the very least the risk of - extreme micronutrient deficiencies. An example is iron-deficiency anaemia, which poses considerable health risks for children aged 0-59 months and pregnant and lactating women. For instance, 97% of households with a poor FCS did not consume any yellow tubers such as beans, whilst 83.3% did not consume any pulses or nuts, both of which are iron-rich food groups.**

Furthermore, 89.8% of households with a poor FS did not consume any fruits in the seven days prior to the assessment, whilst 76.9% did not consume any milk or dairy products. The latter in particular is indicative of a vitamin A deficiency and is reflective of a broader trend of impeded access to high-nutrient food groups for the most vulnerable households. Consequently, the food groups most frequently consumed by households within this subset were cereals – which were consumed for seven days by 86.6% of households – and sweets and sugar, which were consumed by 46.2% of households. These are characterised by their low

²⁴ The FCS is a composite score based on dietary diversity, frequency of consumption and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. Food items are grouped into 8 standard food groups with a maximum value of 7 days per week. The consumption frequency of each food group is multiplied by an assigned weight that is based on its nutritional content. In order to ensure data quality, enumerators were trained to ask this question to the most senior female member of household who, for cultural reasons, is more likely to be familiar with dietary diversity and food consumption patterns in the household.

nutritional value and which indicate substantial access problems to high-nutrient food groups for settlement residents as a whole.

Change in Food Insecure Households between April and June 2014 Decrease in Food Tie: REACH_JOR_IS_FSI_trends Number of Refugees Living in Informal Settlements (by Percentage of Food Insecure Iouseholds (by subdistrict) ubdistrict) unicef 🚯 Iministrative boundaries: UNOCHA Ickground Imagery: USGS atives.org ntact : reach.mapping@impact 2014 varranted to be e ction: GCS WGS 1984 atic Data: REACH - April and Data, Settlements Abandoned refugee settlements 0% - 10% 11% - 20% 21% - 30% 31% - 40% 41% - 50% No data or no settlements Area not assessed in April 2014 Increase in Food New Refugee Insecurity Insecurity designations and ained on this map are be error-free and do be error-free and do be are by the REACH beiates or donors heuu SYRU 10 10 500 1,000 JORDAN - Syrians in Informal Settlements - June 2014 Percentage of Food Insecure Households by Sub-Districts Al Qaym MADABA Ma'ar Al Jezel SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC Umm ar-rasas Al Badi Ash-Shami Alazrag SAUDI AL Az Zan Comparaison between April and June 2014 4-Mafraq MAFF Al Khaledi AMMAN Al Badiah h-Shamaliy Al Gharbeh Umm Al Jemali Al Badih Ash-Shamaliyya C REACH An initiative of ACTED, IMPACT Initiatives and UNDSAT

Map 2: Proportion (%) of food insecure households (May-July 2014)

For humanitarian relief purposes only Production date: 27-Aug-14



Figure 8: Proportion (%) of households by food security status

collected data also enabled REACH to compile a composite food security index²⁵ based on FCS, 30 day food expenditure patterns, total household income and 30 day coping mechanisms to deal with food shortages²⁶. This index is identical to the index used in the May 2014 assessment and will allow a time-series analysis to monitor food security status in ITS. Overall, **38.7% of all assessed households were deemed to be vulnerable to food insecurity, whilst 20.3% were food insecure**. Equally, 41% were food secure, which represents a 1.5% decrease in the proportion of households classified as food secure in comparison to May 2014.

It is worth noting that whilst the overall food security status is proportionally similar relative to May 2014, the observed increase in the total assessed ITS population, as well as the expansion of the geographical coverage of the assessment, means that a much higher number of households is either vulnerable to or food insecure in absolute terms. Therefore, whilst the proportions of households falling into each of these three categories may be very similar, the expansion in the ITS population indicates a deterioration in food security status.

Overall, food insecurity appeared to be most prevalent in Al Mafraq and Ma'an governorates, where 21.8% and 17.7% of all assessed households were classified as food insecure. This is followed closely by Amman, where 16.9% were food insecure at the time of the assessment. In addition to this, 39.8% of households were vulnerable to food insecurity in Al Mafraq, which indicates that despite the on-going harvest, ITS residents still experience considerable food access problems, most likely because of pricing or other access barriers.



Figure 9: Food security status by primary food source

²⁵ FSI scores using the CARI approach are calculated using a 2-step process, where the 3 indicators (FCS, % food expenditure share, and livelihoodsbased coping strategy index (CSI)) are used to calculate the FSI are first converted into a 4-point scale, and then the converted (4-point) scores are averaged (% food expenditure share and livelihoods-based CSI scores are averaged first, and the resulting average is then averaged with the FCS). REACH used a semi-CARI approach to calculate the FSI score, where the first step was used, but not the second). Instead a grid system developed by WFP to categorize households as either food secure, vulnerable, or food insecure was used.

²⁶ The first use of this index was a joint REACH/WFP food security assessment in Jordan; it was then re-used here to allow for comparison between refugee camps, host communities and ITS.

When disaggregated by primary food source, the highest proportion of food insecure households was found amongst the subset which relied on privately purchased food as their primary food source (28% of all assessed households within this subset). This represents a significant deterioration in food security status – in both relative and absolute terms – amongst this subset of households in comparison to May 2014, when 19.2% of households relying on privately purchased food as a primary source of food.

This indicates that **the reliance on private financial resources to access in ITS aggravates food insecurity in the short term**. Whilst this may not be due to food price volatility or high food prices nationally across Jordan, limited resources mean that prices are higher for ITS residents in relative terms.Furthermore, 22.3% of these households resorted to debt-fuelled consumption, indicating that in addition to rendering these ITS residents more susceptible to food insecurity, primarily relying on private means to access food also poses negative consequences for household debt loads.

HEALTH

This section presents the analysis of data on health. Overall, 29.3% of ITS residents were afflicted by a medical problem in the 30 days prior to the assessment, indicating a significant deterioration in health outcomes for ITS residents in comparison to May 2014. The absence of sanitation infrastructure and the type of water source appear to directly impact the prevalence of diarrhoea.

Medical ailments were found to be widespread across all assessed settlements, regardless of location or settlement size. A total of 3,087 (29.3%) individuals were reportedly affected by health problems such as reporting incidences of diarrhoea, fever, skin disease and/or respiratory disease²⁷ during the 30 days prior to the assessment. This represents an increase of 14.3% in the proportion of individuals reportedly suffering from health problems relative to findings from May 2014. This also represents an approximate two-fold increase – in absolute terms – of 2,016 individuals suffering from medical problems, indicating a substantial deterioration in the health situation among populations living in ITS.

In contrast to May 2014, when the prevalence of health problems was disproportionately higher amongst children under 5 than amongst older cohorts, findings indicate that the distribution of medical ailments across demographic groups is largely uniform. However, children aged 0-59 months do suffer disproportionately from problems such as diarrhoea (41.2%) and fever (46.2%).

| Primary water source | Males 0-4 | Females 0-4 | Males 5-11 | Females 5-11 | Males 12-17 | Females 12-17 | Males 18-30 | Females 18-30 | Males 31-59 | Females 31-59 | Males over 60 | Females over 60 |
|---|--------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Municipal connection | 9.5% | 6.4% | 1.8% | 7.0% | 4.8% | 7.3% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Private well | 3.2% | 6.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 7.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Store/ market- bought | 13.7% | 11.5% | 12.7% | 23.3% | 22.2% | 12.7% | 20.0% | 15.4% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Water supplied by private vendor | 73.7% | 75.6% | 85.5% | 69.8% | 71.4% | 80.0% | 60.0% | 76.9% | 66.7% | 71.4% | 100.0 % | 100.0% |

Table 3: Distribution of diarrhoea across demographic groups by primary water source

Key informant interviews conducted at the time of the assessment also suggest a settlement-wide outbreak of bloody diarrhoea in a settlement in the Dafyanah region of Al Mafrag governorate.

²⁷ Given the generally poor knowledge that ITS residents have of health issues, these were the bes approximations – or proxies – for medical ailments that REACH was able to derive from the pilot assessment and as such, only these categories were gauged.

Where sanitation infrastructure is inadequate or non-existent, the health situation appears to be worse. For instance, a high proportion (69.1%) of all incidents of diarrhoea were reported amongst households with access to neither communal nor private latrines, indicating a positive correlation between non-existent sanitation infrastructure and health problems²⁸. The same holds true for skin disease and fever, with 69.2% and 62.1% of all cases of these ailments reported by households with no sanitation infrastructure, respectively.

The effect of factors such as lack of access to safe water and poor hygiene practices on health may be further aggravated by lack of access to medical care. Of those households which reported health problems during the 30 days prior to the assessment, only a quarter (25.2%) reported accessing professional healthcare services to aid them with their conditions.



Figure 10: Proportion (%) of children aged 0-59 months and 6-59 months vaccinated against polio and measles

Vaccination rates against polio and measles were reported to be 52.5% and 74.5%, respectively, amongst children aged 0-59 months (for polio) and children aged 6-59 months (for measles). In terms of **polio vaccination caseload**, this **amounts to a total of 848 at-risk children** in settlements across the assessed governorates who have may still need to receive polio vaccinations²⁹.

In June and August 2014 there was a specific nation-wide polio vaccination campaign in hard to reach locations, including ITS, thus many of these cases may now have had the vaccination. This is of concern especially considering recent reports of polio outbreaks within Syria³⁰ and the relatively high mobility of settlement residents across Jordan. It is important to note that given the limited knowledge that ITS residents possess regarding health issues and poor record-keeping, it is difficult to verify whether at-risk minors aged 0-59 months had truly received polio and/or measles vaccinations.

²⁹ As these vaccinations are not marked on a health card there is no way of verifying the veracity of the head of household's statement, although REACH did take measures to ensure that polio vaccinations were explained properly to the respondents. For instance, OPV was described as "two drops". ³⁰ World Health Organisation: http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2013/polio-syria-20131113/en/



²⁸ Yielding a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.714

Map 3: Proportion (%) of children aged 0-59 months reported as vaccinated against polio



For humanitarian relief purposes only Production date: 25-Aug-14

Informing more effective humanitarian action REAC Н

LIVELIHOODS

This section presents an analysis of livelihoods outcomes for income, expenditure and debt. On average, earned income was 112 JOD in the 30 days prior to the survey, whilst the average debt-to-income ratio was 5.5:1, with substantial variation by governorate. This is a substantial improvement in livelihoods outcomes, with a 40 JOD increase in average household incomes and a 2.5 point decrease in the debt-income ratio. Irregular agricultural waged labour was reported as the primary source of income for the majority of assessed households.

All three REACH ITS assessments in Jordan seem to indicate that **ITS residents were found to be drawn from** the poorest socio-economic strata of Syrian society; essentially poorly educated, unskilled labourers and migrant workers³¹. Consequently, the employment opportunities available to them within Jordan are confined to pre-conflict professions such as casual agricultural labour, thereby severely limiting their capacity to support themselves in formal rented housing. For instance, **45.3% of all assessed households reported agricultural waged labour as their primary source of income**. Whilst this does represent a 10% decrease in the proportion of households reportedly relying on agricultural waged labour to meet basic needs in comparison to May 2014, this relatively stable trend nonetheless thus illustrates the continued and heavy reliance on casual agricultural labour as a means of sustenance.

Despite the decrease in the proportion of households relying on agricultural waged labour as a primary means of servicing basic needs, there has been an increase (a total of 535 households in May 2014 and 813 households in July 2014) in absolute terms in the number of households relying on agriculture. This decrease in the proportion of households is attributable to the concomitant increase in the number of Syrian refugee households residing in ITS as well as the on-going harvest in northern Jordan which may have led to the shift in income-generating patterns. Nevertheless, findings also indicate substantial diversity in livelihood outcomes across assessed settlements and governorates, with ITS households in Al Mafraq, Amman and Irbid displaying the highest degree of diversity in methods of income generation.



Figure 11: Reported primary sources of income by governorate

³¹ REACH, Informal Settlements in Northern Syria (forthcoming).



In Al Mafraq, for instance, 17.7% of households reported relying on loans and borrowed money to service basic needs. Reliance on such communal borrowing practices also holds in Irbid, where 29.6% of assessed households reported relying on this method to service basic needs. At 48.2% of households, cash assistance from non-governmental entities was also a common means of accessing financial capital in Irbid, thereby indicating a high rate of dependence on non-governmental assistance. Once we take into consideration that a total of 8 (from a previous total of 9) settlements had migrated from Irbid governorate during the May-July period, it is likely that dependence on such forms of assistance may have acted as a disincentive for settlement residents from the one remaining ITS to migrate from this location.



Figure 12: Average number of days worked by the head of household in the 7 days prior to the assessment

At 0.7, heads of households residing in ITS in Irbid governorate worked the least in the seven days prior to the assessment across all assessed governorates. Given the heavy reliance of ITS residents in Irbid on cash assistance, this pattern is understandable. At 2.5 and 2.4, the average number of days worked was highest in Zarqa and Ma'an governorates, respectively.

Despite the on-going harvest in Al Mafraq, the average number of days worked by heads of households in this governorate was 1.5 – an increase of 0.6 days in comparison to May 2014. However, once we consider that Al Mafraq is host to the largest ITS population in Jordan, we can argue that the saturation of the casual or informal labour market in Al Mafraq by ITS residents may have lead to increased competition and fewer working days per capita overall despite the increase in the supply of casual employment opportunities.

Employment and Child Labour

This household census has enabled REACH to quantify the exact number – and proportion – of individuals reported as economically active in the informal labour market over the course of the seven days prior to the survey. Given that labour is often allocated on a rolling basis³² to ensure equity, the seven day constraint was felt to be sufficient to gauge economic activity by individual.

Two assumptions can be inferred from the data a) that the household head is not necessarily the only economically active individual if access to an income generating opportunity is established and b) despite the fact that ITS residents respond to economic stimuli, the supply of labour is not abundant enough to support each household. This is confirmed by observations from the field; whilst a small proportion of households were not available due to the fact that the assessment was conducted during working hours, the vast majority of household heads and able-bodied household members were found in the homes during working hours. The data appears to largely validate this assumption; with only **19.8% of all assessed ITS residents reported as working in the 7 days prior to the assessment**, income-generating opportunities appear to not only be scarce, but also intermittent.

³² Discussions with ITS residents and settlement leaders indicate that this is done as a communal coping mechanism and is decided upon collectively (but facilitated by the ITS leader who is in contact with the employer or farm owner) to overcome the scarce supply of labour and ensure that each households has access to an income-generating activity.

Overall, **17.1%** (or a total of 688) of children aged 5-15 were reported as working at the time of the assessment; 34.5% of children aged 12-15 were reported as working, whilst only 2.2% of children aged 5-11 were working, indicating that the propensity to engage in labour increases as children age. Furthermore, males aged 16-17 appear to have worked the most of any demographic group in both proportional (55.7%) and absolute terms (664 males reported as working). This was followed by males aged 12-15, 38.5% (or a total of 373) of whom were reported as working and females aged 12-15, 30.2% (or a total of 267) of whom were reported as working. Conversely, 30.1% (or a total of 179) of males aged 18-30 were reported as working at the time of the assessment, suggesting that overall, minors under the age of 18 were responsible for the bulk of income generation. In fact, 82.2% of all income generating activities conducted in the 7 days prior to the survey was conducted by children under the age of 18.



Figure 13: Demographic distribution displaying total population and total economically active population (7 days)

Assessed ITS in Amman governorate displayed the most diverse income-generating strategies. While a sizeable proportion of households (33.9%) relied on agricultural waged labour to service basic needs, a higher proportion (44.7%) also relied on skilled daily labour. This may indicate that the locations in which ITS were established in Amman governorate were in close proximity to employment opportunities which fall outside of the scope of agriculture.

Observations from the field confirm this; the majority of ITS in Amman were found in the Mwaqqer and Sahab districts of South Amman where clusters of mostly primary industries – including textile production and natural resource processing – provide a more diverse set of employment opportunities. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that settlements which clustered in this industrial belt have not followed the conventional migration pattern and were geographically fixed for over a year, thus indicating that the steady supply of employment from the surrounding industrial sites may have acted as a disincentive for migration.





Map 4: Average reported household income by governorate (30 days)





Figure 14: Average household income levels by governorate

The average household income over the course of the 30 days prior to the assessment was 112 JOD, which represents an increase in average incomes of approximately 40 JOD between May and July 2014. This is most likely due to two factors: the on-going agricultural harvest and the fact that an additional two governorates were assessed.

Despite the fact that the harvest is concentrated in Al Mafraq (where average incomes were 90.2 JOD), the exponential increase in the supply of labour may have exerted deflationary pressure on its cost; this occurs when the supply of labour exceeds the demand for it, allowing employers to leverage increased competition for scarce employment opportunities and lower remuneration levels, which is what has potentially occurred in Al Mafraq following the sizeable migration of ITS residents into this governorate. Consequently, income levels were highest in Amman and Ma'an governorates at 140.5 and 144.2 JOD in the 30 days prior to the assessment, respectively. Whilst comparatively higher incomes in Amman's ITS could be due to the access these settlements have to industrial production, in Ma'an, higher incomes are most likely attributable to the inflationary effects of scarce labour supplies and abundant employment opportunities; essentially the opposite of what findings indicate in Al Mafraq.



Figure 15: Average household debtloads and income by governorate

Findings reveal high levels of debt relative to income across all assessed households, with the average debt-toincome ratio at 5.5. This is indicative of the fact that households conventionally resort to negative coping mechanisms such as debt-fuelled consumption to overcome financial resource constraints. It is worth highlighting again that 13.8% of all assessed households rely on loans and borrowed money as a primary means of servicing basic needs, but **37.8% of households rely on informal loans and borrowing from other households as a secondary source of income**. The use of informal loans as a secondary income source was prevalent across all livelihood types, but at 51.4%, the highest proportion of households resorting to debt to service basic needs was amongst household who relied primarily on the sale of food assistance to generate an income. This is followed by households engaged in skilled daily labour (40.1%) and agricultural waged labour (44.5%). Despite the comparatively higher incomes that these households generate, financial outlays may well be higher in relative terms, meaning that they are also likely to resort to short-term negative coping strategies to meet household and familial needs.



Figure 16: Average household income and long-term debt load by primary source of income

At 50.5%, the majority of assessed households resorted to debt and informal borrowing practices to purchase food; the majority of ITS household in Al Mafraq (59.7%), Irbid (85.7%) and Zarqa (63.3%) reported resorting to borrowing money to purchase food. In fact, average expenditure on food was 122.5 JOD across all assessed households. Using debt to service health expenses was also prevalent, with 16.9% of all assessed households reporting this as a primary reason for debt accumulation. That food and health are the primary reasons for accruing debt is indicative of the fact that ITS households prioritise expenditure on human capital and welfare and are willing to resort to negative coping mechanisms to do so.

Figure 17: Primary reasons for accruing debt by governorate

Map 5: Average household debt load by governorate

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

SHELTER

This section outlines findings on shelter, land tenure patterns and access to municipal services. Findings indicate a significant reduction in the proportion of households reported as paying rent, as well as a significant increase in the use of and access to municipal services in comparison to the assessment conducted in December 2013.

Overall, 90.7% of household reported residing in UNHCR-provided or privately purchased manufactured tents, whilst 8.1% reported residing in makeshift shelters constructed of tarpaulin, plastic sheeting and corrugated or scrap metal. Observations from the field indicate that the longevity of a given settlement has implications for the durability of the shelters or households which inhabit it. This is especially true in Amman governorate, where households residing in 3 of the most geographically fixed and longest-established ITS³³ had invested heavily in household infrastructure. For instance, enumerators noted the existence of kitchens, concrete floors and concrete-reinforced walls in the largest of these settlements, which demonstrates that highly mobile households which respond to economic incentives are less likely to invest in durable shelter infrastructure and/or winterisation, for example.

Land tenure patterns were largely uniform across all assessed governorates, with **97.6% of households residing on private land**. The highest proportion of households residing on public land was in Amman governorate (4.1%), and key informant discussions conducted during data collection seem to confirm that those households residing on public land had the explicit approval of authorities. Despite this, 14% of households were reportedly threatened with eviction in the 30 days prior to the survey; at 29.9%, the highest proportion of households threatened with eviction were found in Amman governorate where the most recent round of evictions occurred at the end of June 2014.

89%

of households reported not paying rent.

14%

Of households reported having been threatened with eviction.

92.6%

of households have an informal municipal electricity connection.

Despite the fact that private land tenure is the predominant mode of occupancy, **88.7% of households reported not paying rent at the time of the assessment, while a sizeable proportion (81.5%) of households in Irbid governorate did pay rent**. This means that the proportion of households reported as not paying rent is 55.1% lower than in December 2013, whilst the average cost of rent for those households who were paying was 30.8 JOD across all assessed households. This represents an increase of 10.8 JOD in comparison to May 2014, which may be because of the on-going harvest and the concomitant increases in households incomes which landlords potentially re-appropriate by charging higher rent prices. Rent costs were highest in Al Mafraq governorate (41.6 JOD) and lowest in Ma'an (10 JOD) and on average, rent costs consumed 27% of household income for those households which reported paying.

Overall, 92.6% of households reported having an informal municipal electricity connection, whilst 5.9% used diesel generators to access electricity for the household. At 58.2%, the majority of households in Ma'an governorate used diesel generators and anecdotal evidence from the field suggests that the remoteness of certain households in Ma'an meant that establishing an informal municipal connection was logistically challenging. Electricity scarcity was also comparatively higher for those households who used diesel generators than informal municipal connections. For instance, whereas households using municipal connections experienced, on average, 1.2 days of electricity scarcity over the course of the 30 days prior to the assessment, households using diesel generators experienced an average of 3.7 days of loss of service. Given that households are required to make substantial financial outlays – **an average of 20 JOD across all assessed households** – to provide fuel, the intermittent provision of electricity is to be expected.

³³ These ITS have now been evicted. Please see Annex 2 for pre-eviction ITS profiles.

WATER AND SANITATION

This section presents findings collected for water and sanitation infrastructure and service provision was found to be severely inadequate across all assessed settlements. Where available, the quality of latrine infrastructure proved to be inadequate and overcrowding was widespread. Despite a marked shift to the use of municipal water services in comparison to December 2013 data and a notable increase in the use of private wells, private water vendors were the primary source of water for the majority of households.

Access to Sanitation

A total of 23 ITS hosting a total of 784 people had no access to either private or communal latrine infrastructure within the settlement. Furthermore, **25.6% (or a total of 475) of all assessed households reported no access to either communal or sanitation infrastructure** thereby indicating a high rate of open defecation. Of the households without private latrines, 63.8% (or a total of 835) of households reported having access to communal latrines.

Figure 18: Rates of access to private and communal latrines

This speaks to the fact that for the minority households that reported access, overcrowding and intensive usage of the available sanitation infrastructure may be leading to degradation. In Ma'an, for instance, the average number of people per available latrine across all assessed settlements is 24.6, although in one ITS in Al Mafraq, this figure stands at 64 when only two communal latrines exist in the entire settlement. Given that the SPHERE standard for such settings is 20 people per available latrine³⁴, the capacity to dispose of human waste in a sanitary way appears to be extremely limited in ITS, which provides a fertile breeding ground for the transmission of disease-causing organisms from one person's faeces to another person as well as the infiltration of the water and food supplies. Findings on health also appear to corroborate this assumption.

At 34.7% and 52.1%, the highest proportion of households with no access to latrine infrastructure was highest in Al Mafraq and Ma'an, respectively. Poor hygiene practices, severely inadequate sanitation infrastructure and the sheer size of the ITS population are all indicative of a public health problem in ITS and potential responses need to take into consideration the type of land tenure and the prospect for mobile solutions if these problems are to be addressed.

³⁴Available at: http://www.spherehandbook.org/en/excreta-disposal-standard-2-appropriate-and-adequate-toilet-facilities/

Map 6: Proportion (%) of households with no access to sanitation

Informing more effective humanitarian action REAC H

Access to Water

Overall, **56.6% of assessed households reported private vendors as their primary source of cooking, drinking and washing water**³⁵, while 8.6% relied on municipal connections and 24.7% used private authorised wells as their primary source of water for the household. While ITS households in Irbid were serviced entirely by private vendors, settlements in Amman displayed a highly diverse set of water sourcing strategies. Although a majority of 57.8% relied on private water vendors, 19.5% of households also relied on "Other sources of water", and all of these indicated water provision which was subsidised by non-governmental organisations. It is also worth noting that this subsidised service was also provided to the five long-term settlements in south Amman³⁶.

Figure 19: Primary sources of water by proportion (%) of households

■ Other source of water ■ Municipal pipeline ■ Private well ■ Store/market-bought ■ Water supplied by private vendor

Longitudinal data from December 2013 to the present indicates that there has been a marked shift away from water provision by private service providers towards a more diversified set of water sourcing strategies, including municipal connections and extraction from private wells. For instance, while no households were reported as using private wells as primary sources of water for the household in December 2013, 24.7% of all assessed households were reportedly accessing wells in July 2014. REACH currently possesses no data as to whether these private wells are certified and

therefore sanitary water sources. This shift can in turn be attributed to the comparatively higher water

the comparatively higher water scarcity or intermittency of service that ITS residents experience with private vendors (which stood at 2.1 days over the course of the 30 days prior to the survey). By comparison, households using municipal connections experienced interruptions to the service for an average of davs. whilst 0.7 households using private wells were water scarce for an average of 0.4

Figure 20: Average water scarcity by primary reported source of water

³⁵ Anecdotal evidence suggests that ITS residents do not, or may not have the resources to, distinguish between drinking and cooking/washing water. ³⁶ These five settlements have now been evicted. Please see Annex 2 for pre-eviction ITS profiles. days over the course of the 30 days prior to the survey.

The communal pooling of resources also appears to be a common mechanism to overcome water scarcity as well as financial constraints, with 60.6% of all assessed households reporting borrowing water from family and/or neighbours to overcome water shortages. Switching to another method of water provision was not reported as a coping mechanism by any household, indicating that water shortages or disruptions to water provision may occur as a result of inadequate financial resources to cover the cost of the service.

Despite this, at 34.5%, a significant proportion of all assessed households also reported borrowing money to purchase water as their primary coping mechanism, which again points to the propensity of ITS residents to resort to debt-fuelled consumption if other options are exhausted or unavailable. This also represents an approximate 10% increase in the proportion of households resorting to debt accumulation in comparison to May 2014. This mechanism was most common in ITS located in Al Aqaba, where 50%% of households reported using debt to address water shortages. As with communal borrowing practices, the pooling of resources appears to attenuate the most acute basic service gaps, even though it does carry the risk of long-term debt accumulation.

Figure 21: Type of coping strategy used to overcome water shortages by proportion (%) of households

CONCLUSION

Through three ITS assessments, REACH has been able to compile a comprehensive dataset on the vulnerabilities, needs and service gaps faced by informal tented settlement residents. This has allowed REACH to conduct a longitudinal analysis of primary data for the December 2013 – June 2014 period. With so many resource constraints and service gaps, the list of ITS needs and vulnerabilities that REACH has identified in Jordan thus far is extensive; from entrenched food insecurity, poor attendance rates for school-aged children to widespread open defecation, there are multiple and often overlapping areas where humanitarian assistance could be effectively targeted in a coordinated manner.

Refugee households in informal settlements continue to be one of the most vulnerable Syrian populations in Jordan. ITS residents are consistently found to be from the poorest socio-economic strata of Syrian society. They are unskilled workers with low level of education. This severely limits employment opportunities in Jordan and most only work in daily unskilled or agriculture labour. The most vulnerable households in this respect resided in ITS in Irbid – which was almost wholly dependent on cash assistance and humanitarian assistance – and Al Mafraq, where the exponential growth in ITS has led to greater competition for scarce labour opportunities and which has led to deflationary pressures on wages.

For instance, the severe shortage in the provision and use of water and sanitation infrastructure has had negative effects across the health and water sectors, with open defecation practices widespread. Poor hygiene practices and inadequate capacities to store water properly strongly correlates with the prevalence of medical ailments such as diarrhea; which was most prevalent in households which had no access to private or communal latrines and relied primarily on private water vendors to service needs. Another issue is open defecation which often leads to the spread of infectious diseases.

Where water is mainly provided by private vendors, the provision of adequate water storage infrastructure could address many of the health and cost-related externalities that are generated as a result of this service. Similarly, infrastructure rehabilitation, hygiene promotion and facilitation of access to latrines could effectively address many of the entrenched health and hygiene issues that refugees in ITS face. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that this may often be limited by the land rights of the ITS tenants, thus requiring mobile or temporary solutions which are tailored to often *ad hoc* migration patterns.

Despite improvements in food consumption frequency and nutritional intake, food insecurity remains widespread, and given the financial resource constraints that have been outlined in this report, access to and consumption of high-nutrient food groups was severely inadequate for the most vulnerable households. Although WFP assistance reached all households, its scope and size contributed greatly to food consumption patterns. This is compounded by the pervasive micronutrient deficiencies which ITS households face as a result of resource constraints and other access barriers, all of which have negative consequences for at-risk groups such as children and pregnant and lactating women.

There has been improvements in the livelihoods, however, considering over 45% of households work primarily in agricultural labor it is possible livelihoods could suffer as the harvest season comes to an end. There was a 40JOD increase in average income since May 2014 which, while providing temporary relief for those with employment opportunities in certain governorates, may be lost after the harvest. The top primary sources of income after employment include using savings, taking loans, and receiving cash from charities. If the end of the harvest adversely affects employment prospects it is possible households will turn to debt and other negative coping strategies in order to provide their basic needs.

Recently, some ITS have been evicted and refugee households referred to the refugee camp in Azraq. If further evictions from ITS occur and households are forced to move to formally established camps, aid actors will need to adapt their response as households in informal settlements have greatly different vulnerability profiles than refugees who recently arrived from Syria. The information collected throughout the survey could be used by camp aid actors as long as evictions are monitored and tracked.

Overall, needs are evidently substantial and are increasing steadily as the number of Syrian refugees leaving host communities and opting for ITS continues to grow. Their situation will certainly be further aggravated due to forced displacemen, loss of livelihoods, and protection concerns are likely to become heightened should evictions continue.

Contrary to popular perceptions, the heavy reliance on casual agricultural labour and other informal income sources is not the primary cause of residency in an ITS and **populations living in these settlement are not economic migrants**, rather this forms part of a coping strategy to access basic services such as water and electricity which the household may have had to forego in formal accommodation.

Syrian refugees living in ITS in Jordan continue to be one of the most vulnerable group among refugee populations affected by the Syria crisis. Based on the assessment findings, REACH developed the following **recommended priority interventions**:

Despite improvements in some sectors, Syrian refugees living in ITS in Jordan continue to be one of the most vulnerable group among refugee populations affected by the Syria crisis. Based on the assessment findings, REACH developed the following **recommended priority interventions**:

- Aid actors should continue to closely monitor ITS, notably their numbers, locations and the demographic composition of the Syrian refugee populations living in these settlements. This is particularly important in a context where evictions of ITS have already occurred and where large-scale movements into ITS can clearly be observed.
- Considering that children account for the majority of the ITS population, this demographic trend means that incorporating the specific needs of children in any common response strategy is vital. Aid actors should strive to ensure that their activities do not aggravate protection risks faced by children as well as to facilitate children's access to protective environments and services.
- Follow-up Child Protection assessments should be carried out by specialist actors in the Protection sector; to identify vulnerabilities of children and to identify children with specific needs.
- Alternative education programmes such as non-formal and informal education and post-basic training schemes should be devised and offered to school-aged Syrian refugees who have never be enrolled in the formal education system in Syria or Jordan. Additionally, information campaigns about subsidised formal education for Syrian refugee children should be carried out across assessed ITS through community outreach programmes.
- Though recent vaccination campaigns for polio in hard to reach areas after this assessment will have increased coverage, future polio vaccination campaigns should continue to prioritise coverage to Syrian refugee populations in ITS in order to reach all at-risk minors.
- Access to water and sanitation in ITS should be urgently addressed to prevent further deteriorations in health and hygiene outcomes whilst taking into account ad hoc migration patterns and minimal land rights, notably the issues of accessing water through private vendors, and widespread open defecation.
- As the harvest season draw to a close, aid actors should anticipate and plan to respond accordingly to the predicted increases in levels of food insecurity and a deterioration in livelihoods outcomes.

Through its continued partnership with UNICEF, REACH will continue to monitor trends within ITS and to this end a monitoring tool has been developed, building on the most up-to-date dataset to facilitate planning in case of emergency evictions. This tool is included in Annex 2: Profiles of evicted settlements from south Amman. Further, REACH aims to promote and supports the development of regional comparative analysis with the view to inform the planning, coordination and implementation of the regional response efforts for the Syria crisis. To this end, REACH has recently produced a regional thematic report on ITS which provides an analysis of the settlements in northern Syria, Lebanon and Jordan.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Household Profile

- 1. Governorate (Cascading)
- 2. How many families live in your household?
- 3. 3a. How many people live in your household?
 - 3b. How many household members do you have in each of these age-groups? (constraint: total values cannot exceed value entered for "Number of people")

Male..... □ 0-4y □ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y □18-30y □31-59y □60+y

Female.
0-4y
5-11y
12-15y
16-17y
18-30y
31-59y
60+y

4. 4a. Are any members of your household disabled? (select one) □ Yes □ No
4b. If yes, then how many members of your household have the following disabilities? (insert group for

each disability type; cannot be greater than the value entered for Q3b)

□ Physical □ Mental □ Visual □ Auditory/Hearing

- Male.....
 0-4y
 5-11y
 12-15y
 16-17y
 18-30y
 31-59y
 60+y
- Female. □ 0-4y □ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y □18-30y □31-59y □60+y
- 5. Where are you from in Syria? (cascading from governorate to sub-district)
- 6. Is this household registered with? (select one "Yes/No" for each option)
 - a) UNHCR: □ Yes □ No
 - b) Ministry of Interior: □ Yes □ No
 - c) Local police station: \Box Yes \Box No

Livelihoods

- 7. What were your household's top 3 ways of paying for basic needs over the last 30 days? (select and rank top 3 options; insert constraint on duplicate responses)
 - a) Savings
 - b) Sale of household assets (jewellery, household appliances, furniture, etc.)
 - c) Sale of productive assets (tools, machinery, vehicles, etc.)
 - d) Begging
 - e) Agricultural waged labour
 - f) Skilled daily labour (construction, carpentry, etc.)
 - g) Loans/borrowed money
 - h) Sale of food assistance
 - i) Sale of non-food assistance
 - j) Cash from charities
 - k) Remittances
 - I) Owner of small commercial business
 - m) Gifts from family/friends
 - n) None
 - o) Other
- 8. How many days did the Head of Household work over the last 7 days? (cannot be greater than 7) Days
- 9. 9a. How many members of your household worked over the last 7 days? (insert constraint; cannot be greater than the value entered for Q3b)

Male □ 0-4y□ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y □18-30y □31-59y □60+yFemale. □ 0-4y□ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y □18-30y □31-59y □60+y9b. How many days did children under 15 work over the last 7 days? (insert constraint; cannot be
greater than the value entered for Q3b; cannot be greater than 7)□ Days

- 10. What was your household's total income (excluding savings) over the last 30 days?
- 11. How much money in JOD did you spend on the following basic needs over the last 30 days?
 - a) Housing/rent: 🗆 JOD

d) Health: □ JOD

b) Food: 🗆 JOD

e) Water: □ JOD

- c) Electricity/cooking heating fuel: □ JOD
- 12. In the last 30 days have you had enough fuel to meet daily household needs?
- 13. 14a. Is your household currently in debt?
 Yes
 No
 - 14b. If yes, then how much debt?
 JOD

14c. If yes, then what are the top 3 reasons that you took on this debt? (select and rank top 3 options; insert constraint on duplicate responses; None as a secondary option – skip logic to next question if selected for second or third choice)

- a) To buy food
- b) To pay for housing/rent
- c) To pay for health expenses
- d) To pay for education expenses
- e) To pay for clothing
- f) To buy tools and machinery

- g) To pay for household costs (electricity, fuel)
- h) To pay for water
- i) To pay for transport costs
- j) None
- k) Other

Shelter

14. What type of shelter do you live in? (select one)

□ Tent □ Makeshift shelter (modified tent) □ Caravan □ Other

- 15. Is the land you live on public (government property) or private? (select one) Public Private
- 16. 17a. Do you pay rent? □ Yes □ No
 - 17b. If yes, then how much do you pay every month? \Box JOD
- 17. Has your household been threatened with eviction by police, government officials or the landowner over the course of the last 30 days? □ Yes □ No
- 18. 18a. Does your household have an electricity connection? (if No, skip to Q18) □ Yes □ No 18b. If yes, what is the source of this electricity?
 - a) Diesel generator

b) Municipal pipeline

- b) Municipal connection (formal)
- c) Municipal connection (informal)
- d) Other
- 19. Over the course of the last 30 days, how many days did you spend without access to electricity? □ JOD

Water and Sanitation

- 20. Currently, what is your household's primary source of drinking and washing water?
 - a) Water supplied by a private vendor
- c) None d) Other
- 21. On average, how much did you pay for this water over the last 30 days?

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

- 22. Over the course of the last 30 days, how many days did you spend without access to water? (value cannot be greater than 30) Days
- 23. If you did not have access to drinking and washing water at some point over the last 30 days, what did you do to cope with this? (select one)
 - a) Borrowed from family/neighbours
 - b) Borrowed money to buy water
 - c) Shop credit
- 24. 24a. Does this household have a private toilet? (if No, go to Q23b; if Yes, skip to Q23c) □ Yes □ No
 - 24b. If no, do you have access to a communal toilet? \Box Yes \Box No
 - 24c. If you have a private toilet, what type of toilet does your household use? (select one)
 - a) Traditional open pit without slab
 - b) Latrine with cement slab
 - c) Other
- 25. How do you dispose of your household waste? (select one)
 - a) Collective bin
 - b) Rubbish pit/unused septic pit
 - c) Burn
- Health
 - 26. 26a. Has a member of your household had any of the following health problems over the last 30 days? (select one "Yes/No" for each option)
 - a) Diarrhea 🗆 Yes 🗆 No
 - b) Skin disease 🗆 Yes 🗆 No
 - c) Respiratory disease □ Yes □ No
 - d) Fever □ Yes □ No

26b. If yes, then which members of your household suffered from these? (looping based on "Yes" entered for each option)

 Male
 □ 0-4y
 □ 5-11y
 □12-15y
 □16-17y
 □18-30y
 □ 31-59y
 □60+y

 Female.
 □ 0-4y
 □ 5-11y
 □12-15y
 □16-17y
 □18-30y
 □ 31-59y
 □60+y

 26c. Did you have professional treatment?
 (if No, then skip to Q29)
 □ Yes
 □ No

26d. If yes, then which of the following did you visit?

- a) Primary health clinic
- b) Public hospital

- e) NGO clinic
- f) Pharmacy g) Other

- c) Maternal services
- d) Community services
- 26e. Was any of the treatment subsidized or free? (select one)
- a) Free
- b) Subsidized
- 27. 27a. How many children aged 0-59 months (0-4 years, 11 months) have received polio vaccinations (2 drops)? (insert constraint: value entered cannot be greater than value for Q3b for the 0-4 years range) □ Children □ Don't know

27b. How many children aged 6-59 months (0-4 years, 11 months) have received measles vaccinations (2 drops)? (insert constraint: value entered cannot be greater than value for Q3b for the 0-4 years range) \Box Children \Box Don't know

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

d) Nothing (stayed without water)

d) Dump near the household

e) Dump in an open field

e) Other

f)

Other

s 🗆 No

Food Security

- 28. What were the top 3 sources of food for your household over the last 30 days? (select and rank top 3 options; insert constraint on duplicate responses; None as a secondary option - skip logic to next question if selected for second or third choice)
 - a) WFP assistance

c) NGO assistance

b) Store/market bought food

d) Gifts from family and friends

- e) None f) Other
- 29. How much did you spend on food over the last 30 days?
- 30. 30a. How many meals does your household usually eat in a day? □ 30b. Over the course of the last 30 days, how many days did you spend without access to food? Davs
- 31. Over the last 7 days, how many days did you consume the following foods? (no value can be greater than 7, ie. 7=7 days)
 - a) Cereals (bread, pasta, wheat flour, bulghur)
 - b) White tubers and roots (potato, sweet potato)
 - c) Vegetables, yellow tubers, leaves
 - d) Fruits
 - e) Meat
 - f) Eggs
 - g) Fish and other seafood
 - h) Pulses, nuts and seeds (beans, chickpeas, etc.)
 - i) Milk and dairy products
 - i) Oil and fats
 - k) Sweets (sugar, honey, jam, cakes, sweet coffee)
 - Spices and condiments 1)
- 32. During the last 7 days, how many times (in days) did your household do any of the following in order to cope with lack of food? (no value can be greater than 7, ie. 7=7 days; 0 = None, 1 = 1 day, 2 = 2 days, 3 = 3 days, 4 = 4 days, 5 = 5 days, 6 = 6 days, 7 = Everyday)
 - a) Eat cheaper food that is not as good as normal
 - b) Borrowed food or received help from friends or relatives
 - c) Eaten less meals a day than normal
 - d) Eaten smaller amounts of food than normal at meals
 - e) Adults eat less so younger children can eat
 - Women eat less so men and small children can eat f)
 - g) Men eat less so women and small children can eat
- 33. In the past 30 days, has your household done any of the following to meet basic food needs?
 - (0 = No, 1 = Yes, 2 = No, because I have already used this up)
 - a) Spent savings
 - b) Bought food on credit or borrowed money to buy food
 - Spent less money on other needs (eg. education/health) c)
 - d) Sold household assets (jewelry, phone, furniture, etc)
 - e) Sold productive goods/assets (sewing machine, tools/machinery, car, livestock, etc)
 - f) Taken jobs that are high risk, illegal and/or socially degrading
 - g) Sent adult household members to beg
 - h) Sent children household members to beg

Education

- 34. 34a. How many of the school-aged children in this household have ever been registered/enrolled in school in Jordan or in Syria? (insert constraint: value entered cannot be greater than value for Q3b for the 5-17 years range)
 - Male □ 5-11y □ Yes □ No
- □12-15y □ Yes □ No
-□16-17y □ Yes □ No
- Female. □ 5-11y □ Yes □ No
-□16-17y □ Yes □ No
 - 34b. How many of the school-aged children in your household attend formal education? (school-aged children defined as 5-17 years of age) (insert constraint: value entered cannot be greater than value for Q3b for the 5-17 years range)
 - Male..... □ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y

 - 35. 35a. How many of the school-aged children in your household attend **informal** education? (school-aged children defined as 5-17 years of age) (insert constraint: value entered cannot be greater than value for O2b for the 5-17 years of age)

value for Q3b for the 5-17 years range)

- Male..... □ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y
- Female. □ 5-11y □12-15y □16-17y
- 35b. If some children have attended informal education, then where have they attended?

□ In an informal education centre outside of this settlement

- □ In an informal education centre in a settlement
- 36. 36a. If some do not attend school, then what are the top 3 reasons for this? (select and rank top 3 options; insert constraint on duplicate responses; None as a secondary option skip logic to next question if selected for second or third choice)
 - a) Lack of funds to send children to school (materials, uniforms, books, etc.)
 - b) Child labour
 - c) Distance
 - d) Not enough space in schools
 - e) Refused enrollment
 - f) Lack of transport
 - g) Safety and security issues
 - h) The household relocates too often for children to enroll
 - i) Children have been out of school too long to go back
 - j) None
 - k) Other

36b. For those children who do not attend school, have any of them missed more than 3 years of education?

37. What is the highest level of education of the head of household?

□ University □ High school □ Primary School □ Vocational training □ None

Intentions

- 38. 38a. Does your household intend to leave this settlement? (select one)
 □ Yes □ No □ Don't know
 - 38b. If yes, then when do you intend to leave? (select one)

□ Now □ less than 2 weeks □ 2 weeks − 1 month □ 1-3 months □ 3-6 months □ Don't know

38c. If yes, then where do you intend to go? (select one)

- a) .. Host community (specify Governorate)
- b) .. Return to Area of Origin in Syria (specify Governorate and District)
- c)...Return to a different location in Syria (specify Governorate and District)
- d) .. Another settlement (specify Governorate)
- e) .. Another country
- f) ...Refugee camp

38d. If yes, then why do you intend to go? (tick and rank top 3 reasons; insert constraint on duplicate responses)

- a) ..Lack of employment/income earning opportunities in this area
- b) .. Inadequate access to health services in this area
- c)...Inadequate access to education in this area
- d) .. Inadequate water in this settlement
- e) .. Poor quality of shelter in this settlement
- f) ... Joining friends/family
- g) .. Cost of food in this area is too high
- h) .. Cost of housing in this area is too high
- i) ... Eviction
- j) ... Safety/security concerns in this area
- k)...Improved security in Area of Origin
- I) ... Depleted savings
- m)..None
- n) .. Other
- o) ..

Location

39. Please collect the GPS coordinates of this settlement to an accuracy of 5 metres.

ANNEX 2: EVICTION PROFILES

JORDAN | Informal Settlements Profile

ITS40

Governorate: Amman District: Al Mwaqqer District # Syrian famillies: 57 Population (individuals): 306 Syrian refugees registered: 92% Families that expressed an intention to leave the settlement*: 6%

Key Statistics

Average # individuals / household: 6.1 Dependents:

77.8% of population under 18 years old 1.6% of population over 60 years old Households with at least 1 member with: Physical disability: 16% Mental disability: 10% Households on private land: 100%

Households threatened by eviction*: 22%

Date of Eviction: 27 June 2014

as reported by households before eviction

Information collected from 50 households living in informal settelments in JORDAN, (June 2014)

😭 Shelter and Energy

Shelter Type:

98% : Tent 2% : Makeshift tent 0% : Other

Households with access to electricity: 96%

🖣 Water and Sanitation

Water source: Water supplied by private vendor Average monthly cost for water: 27.3 JOD

Sanitation Facility Type:

18% : No access to sanitation 66% : Public latrine

2% : Private flush latrine 14% : Private pit latrine 0% : Private other

Predominant waste disposal method: Burn

🌻 Health

Refugees with health issues in the last month: 33.3%

Predominant disease reported:

29% : Diarrhea 29% : Skin Disease 28% : Fever 12% : Respiratory Disease 2% : Other

Individuals receiving medical treatment: 82%

Vaccination Rate:

Polio: 48% of children under 18 Measles: 59% of children under 18

े Food Security

Households reporting lack of food: 96%

Predominant strategies used to cope with lack of food:

86% Sell household goods

 52% Reduce essential non food expenditure
 34% Accept high risk / illegal / exploitative job

. ,

Predominant Food Source: WFP assistance

🖥 Livelihoods

Households with at least 1 member employed: 74% Households with no source of income: 0%

Predominant income sources:

36% : Skilled daily labour 20% : Loans / borrowed money 9% : Agricultural waged labour

Education

School aged girls attending school: 33% School aged boys attending school: 37%

Predominant reason for not attending school:

25% : Lack of funds to send children to school 17.3% : Other 14.4% : Child labour

June 2014

JORDAN | Informal Settlements Profile

ITS41

Governorate: Amman District: Ar rusaifeh District # Syrian famillies: 321 Population (individuals): 1471 Syrian refugees registered: 97% Families that expressed an intention to leave the settlement*: 3%

Key Statistics

Average # individuals / household: 5.6 Dependents:

79.7% of population under 18 years old 2.9% of population over 60 years old Households with at least 1 member with: Physical disability: 12.8% Mental disability: 5.3%

Households on private land: 92.5%

Households threatened by eviction*: 40%

Date of Eviction: 27 June 2014

is reported by households before eviction

Information collected from 265 households living in informal settelments in JORDAN, (June 2014)

😭 Shelter and Energy

Shelter Type:

89% : Tent 11% : Makeshift tent 0% : Other

Households with access to electricity: 98.9%

🖣 Water and Sanitation

Water source: Water supplied by private vendor Average monthly cost for water: 19.9 JOD

Sanitation Facility Type:

3% : No access to sanitation 43% : Public latrine 22% : Private flush latrine 32% : Private pit latrine

0% : Private other

Predominant waste disposal method: Collective bin

藔 Health

Refugees with health issues in the last month: 45.1%

Predominant disease reported:

32% : Diarrhea 28% : Fever 20% : Respiratory Disease 18% : Skin Disease 2% : Other

Individuals receiving medical treatment: 77.4%

Vaccination Rate:

Polio: 71% of children under 18 Measles: 79% of children under 18

े Food Security

Households reporting lack of food: 92.1%

Predominant strategies used to cope with lack of food:

77% Sell household goods

57% Reduce essential non food expenditure 37% Sell productive assets

Predominant Food Source: WFP assistance

🖥 Livelihoods

Households with at least 1 member employed: 74.3% Households with no source of income: 0%

Predominant income sources:

34% : Skilled daily labour 24% : Loans / borrowed money 11% : Cash from charities

Education

School aged girls attending school: 44% School aged boys attending school: 45%

Predominant reason for not attending school:

23.9% : Lack of funds to send children to school 14.7% : Other 13.9% : Distance

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

JORDAN I Informal Settlements Profile

ITS43

Governorate: Amman District: Ar rusaifeh District # Syrian famillies: 59 Population (individuals): 324 Syrian refugees registered: 98% Families that expressed an intention to leave the settlement*: 13.7%

Key Statistics

Average # individuals / household: 6.4 Dependents:

79.3% of population under 18 years old 2.5% of population over 60 years old Households with at least 1 member with: Physical disability: 9.8% Mental disability: 3.9%

Households on private land: 100%

Households threatened by eviction*: 15.7%

Date of Eviction: 27 June 2014

is reported by households before eviction

Information collected from 51 households living in informal settelments in JORDAN, (June 2014)

0% : Makeshift tent

😭 Shelter and Energy

Shelter Type:

Households with access to electricity: 98%

100% : Tent

0% : Other

🖣 Water and Sanitation

Water source: Water supplied by private vendor Average monthly cost for water: 29.1 JOD

Sanitation Facility Type:

6% : No access to sanitation 41% : Public latrine 3% : Private flush latrine 50% : Private pit latrine

0% : Private other

Predominant waste disposal method: Burn

藔 Health

Refugees with health issues in the last month: 35.8%

Predominant disease reported:

31% : Fever 29% : Diarrhea 23% : Respiratory Disease 15% : Skin Disease 2% : Other

Individuals receiving medical treatment: 72.5%

Vaccination Rate:

Polio: 68% of children under 18 Measles: 82% of children under 18

े Food Security

Households reporting lack of food: 92.2%

Predominant strategies used to cope with lack of food:

 84% Sell household goods
 43% Reduce essential non food expenditure

35% Sell productive assets

Predominant Food Source: WFP assistance

🖲 Livelihoods

Households with at least 1 member employed: 86.3%

Households with no source of income: 0%

Predominant income sources:

33% : Skilled daily labour 19% : Loans / borrowed money

16% : Agricultural waged labour

Education

School aged girls attending school: 40% School aged boys attending school: 39%

Predominant reason for not attending school:

21.1% : Lack of funds to send children to school 14.7% : Distance

13.8% : The household relocates too often for children to enroll

ANNEX 3: ITS LOCATION MAP

