

# **METHODOLOGICAL NOTE: MULTI-SECTOR NEEDS ASSESSMENTS (MSNA) – GLOBAL INDICATOR-LEVEL KEY FINDINGS**

April 2023

## CONTENTS

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>1</b>
List of Acronyms	2
List of Tables	2
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>4</b>
Coverage	4
Indicators	9
<b>LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ANALYSIS</b>	<b>13</b>
Food Security	13
WASH	13
Shelter	23
Health	30
Education	32
Livelihoods	36
Protection	47
Other	60

## List of Acronyms

<b>FCS:</b>	Food Consumption Score
<b>HHS:</b>	Household Hunger Scale
<b>IDP:</b>	Internally displaced person
<b>LCSI:</b>	Livelihoods-based Coping Strategies Index
<b>MSNA:</b>	Multi-Sector Needs Assessment
<b>NFI:</b>	Non-food item
<b>rCSI:</b>	reduced Coping Strategies Index
<b>WASH:</b>	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

## List of Tables

Table 1 MSNAs included in the analysis .....	4
Table 2 Indicator availability across contexts.....	10
Table 3 Water source categorization across contexts (as collected in each context).....	14
Table 4 Re-categorization of distance to water source, including time spent waiting and collecting water, in Burkina Faso (the four ambiguous combinations are highlighted in pink).....	17
Table 5 Sanitation facility categorization across contexts (as collected in each context).....	19
Table 6 Re-coding of household-level into individual-level thresholds for sanitation facility sharing indicator.....	21
Table 7 Shelter type categorization across contexts (as collected in each context) .....	23
Table 8 Context-specific aspects when assessing formal school enrolment .....	32
Table 9 Income source categorization across contexts (as collected in each context).....	36
Table 10 Among households with a seasonal / unstable income source, % of households also having had a stable source, having had multiple seasonal / unstable sources, and having had only one seasonal / unstable source.....	40
Table 11 Livelihoods-based coping strategy categorization across contexts (as collected in each context) .....	41
Table 12 Context-specific aspects when assessing child marriage.....	48
Table 13 Context-specific aspects when assessing child labour.....	49
Table 14 Security concern categorization across contexts (as collected in each context) .....	51
Table 15 Context-specific aspects when assessing security concerns.....	57
Table 16 Context-specific aspects when assessing missing civil documentation .....	58

## BACKGROUND

Throughout 2022, REACH, in collaboration with in-country coordination bodies and implementing partners, facilitated 22 Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNA) across 21 countries. While contexts varied, the overarching goal of the MSNAs was to enhance the availability of evidence on multi-sectoral needs of populations affected by crises, in order to support humanitarian strategic decision-making.

In an attempt to create an analysis comparable across crises, data from 14 of these MSNAs was re-analysed in view of aligning the analyses across contexts. This methodological note provides a **detailed overview of the process by which indicators were aligned across contexts, the decisions taken, and associated limitations.**

First, an overview of the methodology, geographical and population group coverage, and included indicators is provided. Next, general limitations to be considered when interpreting the findings are outlined. Lastly – and being the focus of this methodological note – details related to the indicators and how they were aligned are given.

## METHODOLOGY

The following process was followed to identify cross-crisis comparable indicators and generate a cross-crisis comparable analysis:

1. Available core sectoral **indicators of need were mapped** across 21 of the 22 MSNAs. The Libyan refugee and migrant MSNA was not included in the mapping, as data is largely collected at the level of the respondent rather than at the household level. This renders results from this MSNA incomparable to those of other contexts.
2. MSNAs with a **sufficient number of indicators** to generate comparable analyses were retained for analysis. In total, 14 MSNAs were retained for the analysis.
3. Across the retained MSNAs, **data was re-coded for indicators available across most MSNAs** in view of generating results comparable across contexts. In total, 23 indicators were analysed.

## Coverage

Table 1 provides an overview of the 14 MSNAs retained for analysis. The following MSNAs were not retained for analysis:

- **Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Syria:** These MSNAs could not be included in the analysis, because of an insufficient number of indicators having been collected in those contexts that were comparable to other contexts.
- **Colombia:** This MSNA could not be included in the analysis, because it does not allow for the generation of results at the response level. Given the sampling strategy, results can only be generated for each population group separately. This makes it difficult to compare results to those of other contexts.
- **Myanmar:** This MSNA could not be included in the analysis, because it does not allow for the generation of results at the response level. Given the sampling strategy, results can only be generated for each population group separately. This makes it difficult to compare results to those of other contexts. Moreover, results had to be included for reasons of sensitivity of the data.

**Table 1** MSNAs included in the analysis

Country	Period of data collection	Total number of surveys	Population groups	Coverage / representativeness
AFG	30/07/2022 - 04/09/2022	17,262	Refugee; recent IDP; non-recent IDP; recent returnee; other vulnerable households (host community / non-displaced)	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> All 34 provinces, with the exception of the urban population in Kandahar province - province-level results are representative at a 90% confidence level and with a 9% margin of error.</p> <p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error.</p>

Country	Period of data collection	Total number of surveys	Population groups	Coverage / representativeness
				- <b>Overall results:</b> Representative at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error of the assessed population.
BFA	06/06/2022 - 14/07/2022	5,629	IDP; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Nationwide. - <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of non-displaced households in accessible areas (at the region level) at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. Results for IDP households, as well as non-displaced households in inaccessible areas, are indicative only. - <b>Overall results:</b> Indicative.
CAR	18/07/2022 - 16/09/2022	12,328	In-camp IDP; out-of-camp IDP; returnee / repatriate; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> 66 sub-prefectures (excluding Ouanda-Djallé, Ouadda, Yalinga, Bamouti, Zangba, and Ngaoundaye) - sub-prefecture-level results are representative at a 92% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. - <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group at the prefecture level at a 92% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. - <b>Overall results:</b> Representative of the assessed population.
DRC - TS	06/06/2022 - 25/08/2022	9,889	IDP; returnee; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Accessible areas in Tanganyika and Sud Kivu provinces - results are representative at the zone de santé level at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error (for accessible areas). - <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group at the territory level at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error (for accessible areas). - <b>Overall results:</b> Representative of the assessed population.
HTI	12/06/2022 - 13/09/2022	3,896	Rural; urban	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> All departments - department-level results are representative at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error.

Country	Period of data collection	Total number of surveys	Population groups	Coverage / representativeness
				<p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error.</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Representative of the assessed population.</p>
IRQ	05/06/2022 - 16/08/2022	12,839	In-camp IDP; out-of-camp IDP; returnee; host community / non-displaced	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> 64 (out of 120) districts, including those with a minimum number of out-of-camp IDP households, or returnee households, as well as those with a high number of host community households in need; 26 IDP camps - district- / camp-level findings are representative at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error.</p> <p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative at the district / camp level at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error of out-of-camp IDP households, returnee households, and in-camp IDP households. Host community households were only surveyed in ten high-vulnerability districts. Findings for the host community are representative of their district at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. They should not be considered representative of the host community throughout Iraq.</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Results are representative of the assessed population.</p>
KEN - DK	12/10/2022 - 21/10/2022	2,901	Refugee	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Dagahaley, Ifo, and Hagadera refugee camps of the Dadaab refugee camp, and Kakuma 1 to 4 of the Kakuma refugee camp - results are representative of the population in Dadaab and Kakuma camps at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error.</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Results are representative of the assessed population.</p>
LBN	28/07/2022 - 26/11/2022	5,659	Palestinian refugee; migrant; host community / non-displaced	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Nationwide.</p> <p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error at the governorate level</p>

Country	Period of data collection	Total number of surveys	Population groups	Coverage / representativeness
				for migrants and Palestinian refugees, and at the district level for host community / non-displaced households. - <b>Overall results:</b> Results are representative of the assessed population.
LBY	04/07/2022 - 04/10/2022	3,757	IDP; returnee; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> The following Baladiyas were covered: Abusliem, Albayda, Alghrayfa, Aljufra, Azzahra, Bani Waleed, Benghazi, Derna, Ghat, Jalu, Murzuq, Rigdaleen, Sebha, Tazirbu, Ubari - with the exception of Azzahra, baladiya-level results are representative at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. Results for Azzahra are indicative only. - <b>Population group results:</b> Indicative. - <b>Overall results:</b> Indicative.
MLI	05/09/2022 - 16/10/2022	7,640	IDP; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Nationwide. - <b>Population group results:</b> With the exception of the region of Mopti, results are representative of non-displaced households in accessible areas (at the cercle level) at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. Results for IDP households (region level), as well as non-displaced households (cercle level) in inaccessible areas, are indicative only. - <b>Overall results:</b> Indicative.
NER	20/06/2022 - 10/08/2022	9,212	IDP; refugee; returnee; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> All departments, with the exception of the regions of Agadez, Dosso, and Zinder, as well as part of the department of Téra (Tillabéry) - results are indicative as not all communes could always be accessed. - <b>Population group results:</b> Indicative. - <b>Overall results:</b> Indicative.
OPT	30/05/2022 - 06/07/2022	8,331	In-camp refugee; out-of-camp refugee; host community / non-displaced	- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Gaza Strip and West Bank - for the West Bank, results are representative of the population in Oslo Areas A and B, as well as Oslo area C in each governorate at a 95% confidence level and with a 9% margin of error. They are representative of the population in Hebron City, as well



Country	Period of data collection	Total number of surveys	Population groups	Coverage / representativeness
				<p>as in East Jerusalem, at a 95% confidence level and with a 9% margin of error. For the Gaza Strip, results are representative of the population in each locality, as well as camp, at a 95% confidence level and with a 9% margin of error.</p> <p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Results are representative of each population group.</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Results are representative of the assessed population.</p>
SOM	19/07/2022 - 20/08/2022	13,720	IDP; host community / non-displaced	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> All regions, with the exception of Middle Juba - however, the sampling frame and coverage were designed based on accessibility and the location of population groups from previous assessments, and may thus be biased towards (1) urban and peri-urban areas, as well as (2) areas with relatively less active conflict / armed actors.</p> <p>- <b>Population group results:</b> Indicative.</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Indicative.</p>
UKR	10/10/2022 - 21/12/2022	13,449	NA	<p>- <b>Geographical coverage:</b> Nationwide - results are representative of the population in newly accessible areas, as well as in government-controlled conflict-affected areas, at the raion-level at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error. They are representative of the population in other accessible government-controlled areas at the raion-level (as well as for Kyiv city) at a 95% confidence level and with a 7% margin of error. They are indicative for the population in inaccessible conflict-affected areas (representative by groups of raions among those having had access to phones).</p> <p>- <b>Overall results:</b> Results are representative of the assessed population.</p>

## Indicators

Table 2 shows the 23 indicators included in the analysis, as well as their availability across the contexts included in the data mapping. The following indicators were also mapped but not retained for analysis:

- **% of households having reported damage to their shelter:** This indicator is considered less meaningful for an understanding of living conditions than the enclosure issue and living space conditions indicators, because it is based on the respondents' (or enumerators') perceptions of the levels of damage, which are very subjective and difficult to relate to the impact such reported (or observed) damage would have on living conditions. While reports of enclosure issues and living space conditions are also subjective, they do give a more direct understanding of the (perceived) impact of any issues on households' well-being.
- **% of households reporting possession / availability of non-food items (NFIs):** While this indicator was collected across most contexts, it was collected in ways that were considered to generate results too incomparable for this analysis.
- **% of households reporting overcrowding:** This indicator was not collected across majority of contexts.
- **% of households with household members with disabilities (Washington Group questions):** This indicator was not correctly collected in a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting children having dropped out of school, by reason:** While this indicator was (more or less consistently) collected across a majority of contexts, it is currently not considered to provide meaningful results.
- **% of households reporting barriers children face towards accessing education / reasons for children not having attended school:** This indicator was not consistently collected across a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting main income sources, by amount earned:** This indicator was not consistently collected across a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting having had debt, by amount:** This indicator was not consistently collected across a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting having faced challenges meeting their basic needs:** This indicator was not collected across a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting household expenditures:** This indicator was not consistently / correctly collected across a majority of contexts.
- **% of households reporting having faced movement restrictions:** This indicator was not considered meaningful the way it was collected across a majority of contexts

**Table 2** Indicator availability across contexts

	AFG	BFA	CAR	COL	DRC	HTI	IRQ	KEN	LBN	LBY	MDA	MLI	MMR	NER	OPT	POL	ROM	SOM	SVK	SYR	UKR
<b>Food security</b>																					
% of households by Food Consumption Score (FCS)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x			x
% of households by Household Hunger Scale (HHS)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x		x	x
% of households by reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x			x			x
<b>WASH</b>																					
% of households by main drinking water source	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x			x
% of households by distance to water source	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x				x			x
% of households by main sanitation facility	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x			x
% of households sharing their sanitation facility	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x			x
% of households with access to handwashing facility	x	x	x		x		x			x		x	x	x	x			x		x	x
<b>Shelter</b>																					
% of households by shelter type	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
% of households having had enclosure issues	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x		x	x
% of households having had issues related to their living conditions		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x		x		x			x
<b>Health</b>																					
% of households with individuals with unmet health care needs	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
% of households by self-reported barriers towards accessing health care	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x

	AFG	BFA	CAR	COL	DRC	HTI	IRQ	KEN	LBN	LBY	MDA	MLI	MMR	NER	OPT	POL	ROM	SOM	SVK	SYR	UKR
<b>Education</b>																					
% of households with school-aged children not enrolled in formal school	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x			x			x
% of households with school-aged children not having attended formal school	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x			x		x	x
<b>Livelihoods</b>																					
% of households by income source	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x
% of households by Livelihoods-based Coping Strategies Index (LCSI)	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x			x			x
<b>Protection</b>																					
% of households with separated children	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			x	x	x			x		x	x
% of households with married children		x	x		x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x			x			
% of households with working children	x		x		x		x	x	x			x			x	x		x		x	
% of households having had security concerns	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x
% of households with household members missing civil documentation	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x			x
<b>Other</b>																					
% of households by self-reported priority needs	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x		x

## LIMITATIONS

The following **overarching limitations** have to be taken into account when interpreting the findings.

**Findings are reflective of the situation at the time of data collection:**

- **Different levels of humanitarian assistance having been provided across different contexts may affect the comparability of the results.** The provision of humanitarian assistance was not taken into account for this analysis, and all indicators are therefore reflective of the situation given the levels of humanitarian assistance provided at the time of data collection. When interpreting these findings, triangulation with information on the levels of humanitarian assistance provided in each context is recommended.
- **Differences in seasonal patterns between countries may affect the comparability of indicators that tend to show seasonal variation,** such as indicators related to water sources or food security. Such seasonal trends were not considered in the analysis and findings are therefore reflective of the situation in each context at the time of data collection. When interpreting the findings, triangulation with contextual information on relevant seasonal patterns is recommended (see Table 2 for information on data collection periods).
- **Contextual changes since the time of data collection may affect the relevance of the findings.** In case any major contextual changes have occurred, these will have to be taken into account when interpreting the findings.

**Coverage / sampling:**

- **Not all MSNAs covered the entire national territory / affected population.** Most notably, the findings for Kenya only refer to the Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps, while those for DRC, only refer to the provinces of Tanganyika and Sud Kivu. In all other contexts, a majority of the national territory was covered - even if not always the entire territory, e.g. due to access constraints. Moreover, **findings are not always representative of all population groups.** Geographical and population group coverage have to be taken into account when comparing the findings across contexts (see Table 2 for information on geographical and population group coverage).
- **The level of precision of the findings varies by context.** Moreover, not all results are statistically representative and thus generalisable to the entire assessed population. Both has to be taken into consideration when interpreting and comparing the findings across contexts (see Table 2 for information on representativeness).

**Methodological differences:**

- Different **proportions of missing data** (either due to households having preferred not to answer certain questions or due to particularities in data collection tools) may affect the comparability of the results. An increasing possibility of having underestimated gaps with increasing proportions of missing data has to be taken into consideration when interpreting the results.
- **Differences in data collection methodologies,** including question and response option phrasing, may affect the comparability of the results. Such differences have to be taken into account when interpreting the findings.

## ANALYSIS

In the following, any relevant details related to each indicator and its comparability across contexts will be provided.

### Food Security

#### (a) Food Consumption Score (FCS)

*% of households by Food Consumption Score (FCS)*

The FCS was calculated for each context, using the following thresholds:

- **Poor:** <21.5;
- **Borderline:**  $\geq 21.5$  &  $\leq 35$ ;
- **Acceptable:** >35.

#### (b) Household Hunger Scale (HHS)

*% of households by Household Hunger Scale (HHS)*

The HHS was calculated for each context, using the following thresholds:

- **Little:** 0-1;
- **Moderate:** 2-3;
- **Severe:** 4-6.

#### (c) reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)

*% of households by reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI)*

The rCSI was calculated for each context, using the following thresholds:

- **Low:** <4;
- **Medium:**  $\geq 4$  &  $\leq 18$ ;
- **High:** >18.

### WASH

## (a) Drinking water source

*% of households by reported main source of water used for drinking*

Based on in-country feedback, as well as standard categories accepted globally, the reported water sources were grouped into improved and unimproved water sources (or surface water) as follows:

**Table 3** Water source categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

	Improved	Unimproved	Surface water
AFG	Handpump (pumped well) - private Handpump (pumped well) - Public Piped water - public Spring, well or kariz - protected Water trucking / tankering	Spring, well or kariz - unprotected	Surface water (Stream/river/irrigation)
BFA	Forage avec une PMH (pompe à motricité humaine) Puits aménagé / protégé Borne Fontaine / robinet / poste d'eau autonome Eau du robinet dans concession Eau en bouteille - sachet Eau amenée par camion (ONG) ou ONEA	Eau de pluie Puits traditionnel / non protégé	Cours d'eau (fleuve, rivière, ruisseau, eau de surface, etc.)
CAR	Eau du robinet (à domicile ou chez le voisin) Fontaine publique Forage mécanique Forage manuel Puits protégé Bouteilles d'eau / sachets d'eau Eau amenée par camion Source aménagée / protégée	Puits NON protégé Source NON aménagée / non-protégée Eau de pluie	Cours d'eau (fleuve, rivière, ruisseau, eau de surface, etc.), lac / étang / mare ou Flaque / Eau stagnante
DRC	Robinet public/ borne fontaine Forage/ pompe à la main Puits protégés Kiosque de distribution/vendeurs d'eau Raccordement par canalisation à la maison (ou à la maison du voisin) Source protégée Collecte des eaux de pluie (récepteur avec couvercle) Eau en bouteille ou en sachet Camion-citerne	Puits non protégés Source non protégée Collecte des eaux de pluie (récepteur sans couvercle)	Eaux de surface (rivière, ruisseau, barrage, lac, étang)
HTI	Raccordement par canalisation à la maison (ou à la maison du voisin) / Réseau DINEPA Robinet public ou borne-fontaine Puits de forage ou puits tubulaire Puits protégé	Puits non protégé Source non protégée Collecte d'eau de pluie Sachet d'eau	Eau de surface (rivière, barrage, lac, étang, ruisseau, canal, canal d'irrigation)

	Improved	Unimproved	Surface water
	Source protégée Camion-citerne Chariot avec petit réservoir / baril Kiosque à eau Eau en bouteille Gallon d'eau		
IRQ	Piped water into compound Piped water connected to public tap Borehole Protected well Protected rainwater tank Protected spring Bottled water Water Trucking	Unofficial connection to piped network Unprotected rainwater tank Unprotected well Unprotected spring	Surface water without pre-treatment (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal)
KEN	Improved	Unimproved	Surface water
LBN	Piped connection to house Piped connection to neighbour's house Public tap/standpipe Protected borehole or tubewell Protected well Protected spring Rainwater collection Tanker-truck Bottled water	Unprotected borehole or tubewell Unprotected well Unprotected spring	Surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, irrigation channel)
LBY	Public network (connected to the shelter) Public network (connected to the neighbour's shelter) Bottled water Sachet water Tanker-truck Public tap/standpipe Water kiosk Protected well (e.g. in your house or in the mosque) Rainwater collection Protected spring Cart with small tank / drum	Unprotected well Borehole or tubewell Unprotected spring	Surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, irrigation channel)
MLI	Robinet public/borne-fontaine Forage/ pompe à main Puits protégé Kiosque de distribution d'eau Raccordement pas canalisation à la maison (ou a la maison du voisin) Source protégée Eau en bouteille - sachet Camion-citerne	Puits non protégé Source non protégée Collecte des eaux de pluie	Eaux de surface (rivière, ruisseau, barrage, lac, étang)
NER	Forage avec pompe à motricité humaine (à pied ou à main)	Puits non protégé (contre les	Eaux de surface (rivière, ruisseau, barrage, lac, étang)



	Improved	Unimproved	Surface water
	/forage avec pompe électrique (poste d'eau autonome ou mini induction) Puits protégé (avec un couvercle ou avec une pompe) Vendeurs d'eau (kiosque, chariot) Collecte des eaux de pluie Eau en bouteille/en sachet Camion-citerne Raccordement par canalisation à la maison (ou à la maison du voisin)/Robinet Robinet public/borne-fontaine	impuretés, les accidents) Eau de source (qui sort de la nappe phréatique, sous la terre)	
OPT	Piped water into compound Piped water connected to public tap/filling point Protected well Protected rainwater tank Protected spring Bottled water Water Trucking	Illegal connection to piped network Unprotected rainwater tank Unprotected well Unprotected spring	Surface water without pre-treatment (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal)
SOM	Piped connection to house (or neighbour's house) Public tap/standpipe Borehole or tubewell Protected well Protected spring Tanker-truck Cart with small tank / drum Water kiosk Bottled water	Unprotected well Unprotected spring Rainwater collection	Surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, irrigation channel)
UKR	Tap drinking water (centralized water supply) Technical piped water Public tap/standpipe Personal protected borehole or well Public well or boreholes (shared access) Trucked in water (truck with a tank) Water kiosk Bottled water	NA	NA

**Additional note:**

- While in all other contexts countries could only report one drinking water source, in Ukraine, they could report multiple water sources. This does not affect comparability, as all water sources in Ukraine are improved.

## (b) Distance to water source

*% of households by reported distance to main water source (time taken to go, fetch water, and return)*

For most contexts, where this question was asked, question phrasing and response options were directly comparable, with the question having been “How long does it take to go to your main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source)?”, and the response options having included:

- Water on premises;
- Less than 5 min to fetch and return;
- Between 5 and 15 min to fetch and return;
- Between 16 and 30 min to fetch and return;
- 31 min or more to fetch and return;
- Don't know.

The following two exceptions have to be taken into consideration:

- **Burkina Faso:** The time taken to go and return, and the time taken to queue and get water, were assessed separately by the following two questions:

- (1) Combien de temps faut-il à votre ménage pour aller collecter l'eau nécessaire à votre source d'eau principale (trajet aller-retour à la source) ?
- (2) Combien de temps faut-il à votre ménage pour attendre et collecter l'eau à votre source d'eau principale (attente et collecte) ?

For the purpose of this analysis, the answers to the two questions were combined as shown in Table 4. With the exception of four cases, the final category is unambiguous. Overall results are, however, relatively high. It may be that distances are large, and / or that asking the two questions separately leads to comparably higher estimates being given than when asking just one question. In order not to risk an underestimation of severity by not accounting for possibly high distances – given that the large majority of combinations were unambiguous – it was decided to keep the indicator for analysis, and assign the lower of the possible two category to the ambiguous combinations.

- **Mali:** The question only asked about the time taken to reach the water source and return from it with water. This does imply that time spent at the water source to get the water is included, but it is possible that distances are underestimated relative to other contexts. Given that, however, it should theoretically generate comparable results, while results do still give a useful indication of distances overall, the indicator was kept for analysis.

**Table 4** Re-categorization of distance to water source, including time spent waiting and collecting water, in Burkina Faso (the four ambiguous combinations are highlighted in pink)

Time taken to go / return	Time spent waiting and collecting water	Final category (combination)
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	Moins de 5 minutes	>30 min
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	>30 min
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	>30 min

Time taken to go / return	Time spent waiting and collecting water	Final category (combination)
De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	>30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	<=30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	Moins de 5 minutes	<=30 min
Entre 16 et 30 minutes	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	Moins de 5 minutes	>30 min
Entre 31 et 45 minutes	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	>30 min
De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	<=30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	<=30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	Moins de 5 minutes	<=30 min
Entre 5 et 15 minutes	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
Eau dans la concession / Eau sur place	Eau dans la concession / Eau sur place	On premises
Moins de 5 minutes	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	<=30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	<=30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	Moins de 5 minutes	<=30 min
Moins de 5 minutes	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	De 1 heure à moins de 3 heures	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	Entre 16 et 30 minutes	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	Entre 31 et 45 minutes	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	De 46 minutes à moins de 1 heure	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	Entre 5 et 15 minutes	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	3 heures ou plus	>30 min
3 heures ou plus	Moins de 5 minutes	>30 min

### (c) Sanitation facility

*% of households by sanitation facility usually used*

Based on in-country feedback, as well as standard categories accepted globally, the reported sanitation facilities were grouped into improved and unimproved sanitation facilities (or open defecation) as follows:

**Table 5** Sanitation facility categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

	Improved	Unimproved	Open defecation
AFG	Flush or pour/flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab and platform Pit VIP toilet	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole Bucket toilet Plastic bag Hanging toilet/latrine	None of the above, open defecation
BFA	Latrines traditionnelles avec dalle en béton/Latrine SanPlat Latrines SanPlat améliorées (dalle en béton et fosse maçonnée) Latrines VIP (une fosse ou double fosse) Latrines EcoSan (séparation urines/fèces) Toilette à chasse d'eau manuelle ou mécanique (avec fosse septique)	Latrines traditionnelles sans dalle en béton	Défécation à l'air libre
CAR	Latrines à siphon d'eau (Toilettes avec chasse d'eau) Latrines fosse avec dalle et plate-forme Latrines à fosse surélevée	Latrines fosse sans dalle ou plate-forme / trou ouvert Trou ouvert Latrines ventilées améliorées WC seau Sac plastique	Défécation en plein air
DRC	Toilettes à chasses d'eau manuelles ou mécaniques Latrines à fosses avec dalle et plate-forme Toilette à fosse VIP	Latrines à fosses sans dalle ni plate-forme Trou ouvert Sceaux Sacs plastiques Toilettes / latrines suspendues	Aucune des propositions, défécations à l'air libre
HTI	Toilettes à chasse d'eau du robinet / manuelle (flush et pour/flush) Toilettes à fosse avec dalle et plate-forme	Trou ouvert Toilette à seau / compost Sac en plastique	Défécation à l'air libre

	Improved	Unimproved	Open defecation
	Toilettes à fosse sans dalle ni plateforme Toilettes suspendues		
IRQ	Flush or pour/flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab or platform Pit VIP toilet	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole Bucket toilet Plastic bag Hanging toilet/latrine	None of the above, open defecation
KEN	Flush or pour toilet Pit VIP toilet Pit latrine with a slab or platform	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole Bucket toilet Plastic bag Hanging toilet/latrine	Open defecation
LBN	Flush or pour/flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab and platform Pit VIP toilet	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole	None of the above, open defecation
LBY	Flush or pour/flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab and platform Pit VIP toilet (Pit latrine with ventilation)	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole Bucket toilet Plastic bag Hanging toilet/latrine	None of the above, open defecation
MLI	Toilettes à chasses d'eau manuelles ou mécaniques Latrines à fosse avec dalle et plateforme Toilette à fosse VIP	Trou ouvert Latrines à fosse sans dalle ni plateforme Seaux Sacs/Sachets plastiques Toilettes/latrines suspendues	Aucune des propositions ci-dessus, défécation à l'air libre
NER	Chasses d'eau manuelles ou mécaniques Latrines à fosse avec dalle et clôture Toilette à fosse VIP (avec tuyau d'aération)	Latrines à fosse sans dalle ni clôture /Trou ouvert Latrine sans fosse avec clôture Seaux/récipient Sacs plastiques	Défécation à l'air libre
OPT	Flush or pour flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab or platform Pit VIP toilet	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole Bucket toilet Plastic bag Mobile latrine	None of the above, open defecation
SOM	Flush or pour/flush toilet Pit latrine with a slab and platform Pit VIP toilet	Pit latrine without a slab or platform Open hole	None of the above, open defecation
UKR	Flush or pour/flush toilet to a sewerage network	Ventilated pit latrine	NA

Improved	Unimproved	Open defecation
Flush or pour/flush toilet to a septic tank or pit		
Flush toilet piped to a drainage channel		
Compost toilet		
Pit latrine with a slab and platform		

**Additional note:**

- While in all other contexts countries could only report one sanitation facility, in Ukraine, they could report multiple sanitation facilities. For the purpose of this analysis, if households reported an unimproved facility among the main facilities used, they were categorized as having used an unimproved facility. This does not have any major effect on comparability, as it only affects 0.6% of households that had reported an unimproved, as well as an improved facility.

**(d) Sanitation facility sharing**

*% of households reportedly having shared their usual sanitation facility with people outside the household (or practiced open defecation)*

This indicator is based on the following thresholds:

- No sharing;
- Sharing with 20 people or less;
- Sharing with more than 20 people;
- Sharing with more than 50 people.

With the exception of Mali, however, households were asked about the number of households (rather than the number of people) they had shared their facilities with. For the purpose of this analysis, household-level thresholds corresponding to the individual-level thresholds above were set based on the average (unweighted) household size in each context. For Mali, households were considered as not having shared facilities if they had reportedly shared their facility with a number of people equal to or lower than the average (unweighted) household size in Mali (Table 6).

**Table 6** Re-coding of household-level into individual-level thresholds for sanitation facility sharing indicator

	Average (unweighted) household size	Lower threshold ('<=20 people')	Upper threshold ('>50 people')
AFG	6.651663	<=3 households	>7 households
BFA	7.793924	<=2 households	>6 households
CAR	5.232121	<=3 households	>9 households
DRC	6.578926	<=3 households	>7 households
HTI	5.069815	<=3 households	>9 households
IRQ	6.190528	<=3 households	>8 households
KEN	NA	NA	NA

	<b>Average (unweighted) household size</b>	<b>Lower threshold ('&lt;=20 people')</b>	<b>Upper threshold ('&gt;50 people')</b>
LBN	3.105319	<=6 households	>16 households
LBY	5.134416	<=3 households	>9 households
MLI	5.773953	NA (but 6 people or less was considered as not shared, assuming those 6 were part of the same household)	NA
NER	6.174663	<=3 households	>8 households
OPT	5.365622	<=3 households	>9 households
SOM	5.504264	<=3 households	>9 households
UKR	2.457432	<=8 households	>20 households

**Additional note:**

- In Kenya, it was only assessed whether or not the sanitation facility was shared with other households, irrespective of the number of households / people it was shared with. Therefore, results can only be presented as a binary.

**(e) Handwashing facility***% of households showing or reporting their usual handwashing facility*

In 6 (AFG, BFA, CAR, DRC, MLI, SOM) of the 11 contexts where this indicator was collected, households were asked to show the handwashing facility they most often used to wash their hands. Enumerators then recorded the availability of facilities, with or without water and / or soap, according to their observation.

In Niger and Ukraine, households were asked if they had (access to) a handwashing facility with water and soap, and answers recorded as reported. While differences between contexts have to be taken into consideration, results do suggest that observation leads to higher proportions of households being reported as not having had handwashing facilities, with relatively low proportions reported in Niger, compared to DRC, CAR, Burkina Faso, and Mali.

In Iraq, households were asked separately (1) about the kind of handwashing facility they usually used to wash their hands, and (2) if there was soap available in their households. For the purpose of this analysis, responses to these two questions were combined as follows:

- No handwashing facility, if no handwashing facility was reported under (1);
- Handwashing facility without water or soap, if a handwashing facility was reported under (1) but no soap under (2);
- Handwashing facility with water and soap, if a handwashing facility was reported under (1) and the availability of soap was reported under (2).

It is possible that this may lead to a slight overestimation of the proportion of households having had access to a handwashing facility with water and soap, as it would not capture if a handwashing facility was available but without water, or if soap was available in the household but not necessarily at the

handwashing facility. However, for the purpose of this analysis, results were considered to remain broadly cross-crisis comparable.<sup>1</sup>

Lastly, in Libya and oPt, households were asked if they had a handwashing facility with water and soap, but their answers only recorded as either 'yes' or 'no', i.e. the presence or absence of water and soap at the handwashing facility not specifically recorded, and only the binary answers could be analysed.

## Shelter

### (a) Shelter type

*% of households by reported type of shelter they lived in at the time of data collection*

With the help of in-country feedback, the reported shelter types were grouped into 'adequate' (i.e. solid / finished house / apartment / building, including short-term rentals / hotels; 'traditional' types of shelter) and 'inadequate' (unfinished / non-enclosed building; collective shelter; tent; makeshift shelter; emergency shelter; public building not intended for living) shelter types (or no shelter) as follows:

**Table 7** Shelter type categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

	Adequate	Inadequate	No shelter
AFG	Live in Mud Houses Live in transitional shelter (building made of wood, pakhsa, sun-dried bricks, or steel with steel roof or without roof) Live in transitional shelter built by NGOs (building made of wood, pakhsa, sun-dried bricks, or steel with steel roof or without roof) Live in permanent shelter with poor materials (building made of pakhsa or sun-dried bricks with permanent roof) Live in permanent shelter with robust materials (fired-bricks, concrete, stone with permanent roof)	Live in Partially built concrete houses Live in emergency shelter built by NGOs (tents) Live in a makeshift shelter (tents, huts, kodai, kapa) Live in collective center (building not intended for living) Live in unfinished shelter	Live in open space
BFA	Maison construite	Abris de fortune (paille) Abris d'urgence Constructions non destinées au logement (hangars, dépôts, constructions auxiliaires des fermes, etc.) Bâtiments communautaires Bâtiment inachevé	Pas d'abris

<sup>1</sup> Also compare [JMP data](#) from 2018 that showed that 96% of households in Iraq had access to a handwashing facility with water and soap.



	Adequate	Inadequate	No shelter
CAR	Structure permanente - Maison en dur (briques cuites/parpaings, avec ciment) Structure semi-permanente - Habitat à long terme en paille (habitat traditionnel)	Structure temporaire - Abri d'urgence / de transition (structure + cordes, bâche(s)) Structure temporaire - Abri d'urgence / de transition (structure + cordes, paille) Abri collectif (maison abandonnée / école désertée / église / etc.) Tente	Aucun abri (dort à l'air libre)
DRC	Maison solide / terminée (en briques adobe cuites, en ciment...) Appartement solide / terminé Maison terminée en matériaux semidurables (adobe non cuite, terre, planche...)	Bâtiment non couvert / non terminé Abri collectif (école, église, centre de santé, etc.) Tente ou abris d'urgence Abri de fortune	A l'air libre (aucun abri)
HTI	Maison solide/terminée Appartement solide/terminé Abris léger/traditionnel (paille, chaux, terre, sable ou palmier) Abri peu ou pas solide, voire endommagé Abri léger (toit en tôle)	Bâtiment non couvert/non terminé/non solide Abri collectif Tente Abri improvisé	A l'air libre (aucun abri)
IRQ	With host family Hotel/motel or short-term rental Habitual residence - good condition (ok for living inside) Habitual residence - damaged/destroyed (not ok for living inside) Rental apartment/house - good condition (ok for living inside) Rental apartment/house - damaged/destroyed (not ok for living inside) Prefab/caravan/RHU	Makeshift shelter (with scavenged material such as zinc sheets, cardboards, etc.) Religious building Public building (school, etc) Sub-standard shelter not for residential purposes/non-residential structure (garage, farm building, shop etc.) Tent Unfinished or abandoned residential building	NA
KEN	Thatched hut Mud bricked home Concrete bricked home	Emergency tent Ironsheets shelter	I have no shelter
LBN	Apartment/house/room Concierge's room in residential building Farm Prefab unit Hotel room	Active construction site Agricultural/engine/pump room Factory Garage School Shop Tent Warehouse Workshop	NA
LBY	House Apartment (not shared)	Room shared with other people (not household members)	Outdoors / no shelter at all

	Adequate	Inadequate	No shelter
	Private room in an apartment/house shared with other people (not household members) Temporary shelter provided by INGO or local NGO Hotel	Public building not usually used for shelter (e.g. school, mosque, etc.) Private building not usually used for shelter (e.g. basement, garage, store, warehouse, etc.) Unfinished/unenclosed building Emergency shelter not provided by INGOs or local NGOs (e.g. tent or caravan) Camp or informal settlement	
MLI	Maison solide/terminée Appartement solid/terminé RHU (refuge house unit / unité de logement des réfugiés) ABRIS D'URGENCE "AMELIORE" TYPE SAHELIEEN (ou case traditionnelle) Tente	Bâtiment non couvert/non terminé Bâtiments communautaires Abri collectif Abri improvisé	A l'air libre (aucun abri)
NER	Case (structure en banco, toit en paille) Abri transitionnel (entre l'abri d'urgence et l'abri durable), fait pour durer un an, avec du matériau qui ne se dégrade pas facilement (avec du fer, tuyau, etc.), abri qui peut être démontable, transportable. A la possibilité de devenir durable. Tente nomade (matériau plus solide qu'une tente traditionnelle, cuir, bois solide ou fer pour les piquets et le toit) Abri/maison durable (en matériaux définitifs) (par exemple: maison en banco, ciment, terre)	Batiment public/privé (sans abri propre/à lui) Habitat de paille/abri de fortune (fait de façon autonome, tout en paille) Tente traditionnelle (faite avec des matériaux locaux, branches, chiffons, bâches) Abri d'urgence (donné par assistance humanitaire) (fait avec du matériau facilement dégradable; avec du bois comme piquets et comme traverses)	A l'air libre (aucun abri) (qui n'a pas d'abri à lui, ni d'abri pour dormir)
OPT	Solid / finished house Solid / finished apartment	Unfinished / non-enclosed building Collective shelter Tent Makeshift shelter	None (sleeping In open)
SOM	Buul, Timber and plastic sheet with CGI roof, not in IDP settlement Stone/brick wall and CGI roof Brick and concrete house (solid, finished house or apartment) Stick wall and thatch roof	Buul, Timber and plastic sheet with CGI roof, in IDP settlement CGI sheet wall and CGI roof Mud and stick wall and CGI roof Unfinished / non-enclosed building Collective shelter Tent Makeshift shelter	None
UKR	Detached house Apartment in apartment block	Collective site / public building Non-regulated or government-approved building	NA

**Additional notes:**

- **Burkina Faso:** While in most contexts, households could only report one shelter type, in Burkina Faso, they could report multiple shelter types. For the purpose of this analysis, only the shelter reported as primary shelter was considered, as only for this shelter also enclosure issues and living space conditions were collected. This will not lead to any major underestimation of the proportion of households having lived in inadequate shelter types, as only 2% of households reported an inadequate secondary shelter, while having reported an adequate primary shelter.
- **Kenya:** Households could report multiple shelter types. As the primary shelter was not specified in this case, for the purpose of this analysis, the household was classified as having lived in an inadequate type of shelter, if at least one inadequate type of shelter had been reported. This will not lead to any major overestimation of the proportion of households having lived in inadequate shelter types, as only 3% of households reported both an adequate and an inadequate type of shelter.
- **Somalia:** Households could report multiple shelter types, one after the other. For the purpose of this analysis, the shelter reported first was considered the primary shelter and its shelter type reported as the final shelter type for the household. This will not lead to any major underestimation of the proportion of households having lived in inadequate shelter types, as only 3% of households reported an inadequate type of shelter, while first having reported an adequate type of shelter (and no households first reported an inadequate type of shelter and then an adequate type of shelter).

## (b) Enclosure issues

### *% of households reporting shelter enclosure issues*

In most contexts, the following enclosure issues were assessed:

- Unsafe (doors or windows missing, broken, unable to shut properly, cracks in roof or walls);
- Lack of insulation from cold;
- Leaks during rain;
- Limited ventilation;
- Presence of dirt or debris;
- Lack of water supply;
- Lack of or defective sewage system; and
- Total collapse or shelter too damaged for living.

Households were classified as having had enclosure issues as soon as at least one of the options above was reported. Only 'total collapse or shelter too damaged for living' was considered separately for reporting. The following (minor) deviations have to be taken into consideration:

- **Afghanistan:** First, a distinction was made between leaking during heavy and leaking during light rain, as well as between removable and non-removable dirt or debris. Secondly, the shelter being totally destroyed was also captured by a separate question related to shelter damage, which was included in the analysis here. Lastly, while in all other contexts, households could report as many options as applied, in Afghanistan, they could only report up to 3 enclosure issues. None of this will have any major impact on comparability. First, leaking during rain and dirt or debris can be captured irrespective of the distinctions made in this particular case. Secondly, only 1% of households reported a totally destroyed shelter when asked about shelter damage but had not reported total collapse under enclosure issues, i.e. no major overestimation compared to other contexts by also taking the damage-related question into account is to be

expected. Lastly, as all enclosure issues were equally considered for the analysis, the number of issues households could report is irrelevant.

- Burkina Faso:** The same distinctions as in Afghanistan were made. In addition, lack of insulation included lack of insulation from either cold or heat, limited ventilation included limited ventilation and limited ventilation as a result of a limited space, and options were added, including structural problems caused by termites, premature wear of the tarpaulins, and stagnant water following rain. 'Unsafe', as well as 'total collapse', were missing as options. Shelter damage was assessed separately, however, and included the option 'completely destroyed', which was considered here. Moreover, 'lack of water supply', and 'lack of or defective sewage system' were missing as options. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, more nuanced response option phrasing does not affect the analysis, as any enclosure issues are equally considered. Secondly, while 'unsafe' and 'total collapse' were missing, 'structural problems' and 'premature wear of the tarpaulins' speak to the same issue, even if in a slightly more narrow sense, while 'completely destroyed' could be drawn from the damage-related question. Stagnant water during rain speaks to the same issue as leaking during rain (only 3% of households reported stagnant water but no leaking). Lastly, looking at trends across contexts, reports of a lack of water supply or a defective sewage system in the absence of other enclosure issues are very uncommon, only being the case for 7% of households in Afghanistan, and otherwise, at a maximum 1% to 4% of households in other contexts where they were assessed. Thus, results for Burkina Faso are considered to remain comparable to the other contexts.
- CAR:** Two additional options were included – the presence of termites, and collapse during rain. Similar to Burkina Faso, both were considered to speak to a lack of structural stability, comparable to 'cracks in roof or walls', and thus included in the analysis, assuming that they would not have any major impact on comparability (5% of households reported either or both of these two issues and none of the others).
- Haiti:** A distinction was made between a lack of insulation from heat and a lack of insulation from cold. Moreover, in addition to the response option 'totally destroyed' under enclosure issues, the response option 'total collapse or too dangerous for living' from a damage-related question was considered to capture cases of totally destroyed shelters. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, more nuanced response option phrasing does not affect the analysis, as any enclosure issues are equally considered. Secondly, only 2% of households reported a totally collapsed shelter when asked about shelter damage but had not reported total destruction under enclosure issues, i.e. no major overestimation compared to other contexts by also taking the damage-related question into account is to be expected.
- Iraq:** A distinction was made between leaking during heavy and leaking during light rain, as well as between removable and non-removable dirt or debris. Such more nuanced response options will not affect comparability, as any enclosure issues are equally considered.
- Kenya:** In addition to the response option 'total collapse or too damaged for living' under enclosure issues, the response option 'total damage' from a damage-related question was considered to capture cases of totally destroyed shelters. Moreover, 'lack of water supply', and 'lack of or defective sewage system' were missing as options. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, only 2% of households reported a totally destroyed shelter when asked about shelter damage but had not reported total collapse under enclosure issues, i.e. no major overestimation compared to other contexts by also taking the damage-related question into account is to be expected. Secondly, looking at trends across contexts, reports of a lack of water supply or a defective sewage system in the absence of other enclosure issues are very uncommon, only being the case for 7% of households in Afghanistan, and otherwise, at a maximum 1% to 4% of households in other contexts where they were assessed. Thus, results for Kenya are considered to remain comparable to the other contexts.

- **Lebanon:** Response options were formulated slightly different but assumed to speak to the same issues as above, such that comparability would not be affected. Specifically, 'window/ doors are not sealed to natural elements (missing, broken, unable to shut properly)' was assumed to broadly correspond to the option 'unsafe' above; 'leaking roof', as well as 'leakage/ rottenness in the walls/ floors' were assumed to broadly correspond 'leaks during rain' above; and water pipes not being function and a lack of water supply were both assumed to broadly correspond to a lack of water supply. Lastly, 'Electricity installation/ connection are not adequately installed or not safe' was added and considered in this analysis as a substitute for 'a lack of electricity', which is recommended to be added in relevant contexts.
- **Libya:** 'Electricity' was added as an option, as recommended in relevant contexts. In addition the presence of mould or moisture issues, as well as the building being made of iron, wood, or other unsuitable materials, were added as response options. 'Total collapse' was missing as an option. Shelter damage was assessed separately, however, and included the option 'destroyed', which was considered here. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, the additional options are considered to speak to the same issues as the standard options (only 3% reported any of the additional options without having reported any of the standard options). Secondly, the option 'destroyed' from the damage-related question is considered a substitute for the missing option of 'total collapse'.
- **Mali:** 'Total collapse' was missing as an option. Shelter damage was assessed separately, however, and included the option 'total collapse or too damage for living', which was considered as a substitute here, such that comparability would not be affected.
- **Niger:** 'Total collapse' was missing as an option. Shelter damage was assessed separately, however, and included the option 'total collapse', which was considered as a substitute here, such that comparability would not be affected. Moreover, the following options were missing: 'unsafe', 'lack of insulation from cold', 'presence of dirt or debris'. This is not considered to have a major impact on comparability neither, as 2021 MSNA results showed that in only 1% of the cases (unweighted), leaking during rain or limited ventilation were not reported as issues, while dirt / debris or a lack of insulation were ('unsafe' was not an option in the 2021 MSNA neither, but it is assumed that leaking during rain continues to be the major issue).
- **Somalia:** 'Lack of or defective sewage system' was missing as an option. Moreover, in addition to the response option 'total collapse or shelter too damaged for living' under enclosure issues, the same response option from a damage-related question was considered to capture cases of totally destroyed shelters. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, looking at trends across contexts, reports of a lack of water supply or a defective sewage system in the absence of other enclosure issues are very uncommon, only being the case for 7% of households in Afghanistan, and otherwise, at a maximum 1% to 4% of households in other contexts where they were assessed. Thus, results for Somalia, having captured only a lack of water supply, are considered to remain comparable to the other contexts. Secondly, only 5% of households reported a totally collapsed shelter when asked about shelter damage but had not reported total collapse under enclosure issues, i.e. no major overestimation compared to other contexts by also taking the damage-related question into account is to be expected.
- **Ukraine:** 'Defective or unemptied septic systems' was added as an option. Moreover, in addition to the response option 'total collapse or shelter too damaged for living' under enclosure issues, the response option 'unrepairable damage / unsafe for living' from a damage-related question was considered to capture cases of totally destroyed shelters. None of this is considered to have a major impact on comparability. First, only 0.4% reported defective / unemptied septic systems as their only issue. Secondly, only two households reported unrepairable damage when asked about shelter damage but had not reported total collapse under enclosure issues, i.e. no major overestimation compared to other contexts by also taking the damage-related question into account is to be expected.

## (c) Living space conditions

*% of households reporting issues related to the living conditions inside their shelter*

In most contexts, the following issues related to living space conditions were assessed:

- At least one member of the household has to sleep outside or on the floor (insufficient space, insufficient sleeping mats/mattress);
- Unable to cook and/or store food properly (cooking facilities are unsafe, insufficient cooking items);
- Unable to store water properly (insufficient water containers);
- Unable to adequately perform personal hygiene (lack of bathing facilities, bathing facilities unsafe, insufficient hygiene kits);
- Does not feel protected in the shelter (unable to lock home securely, insufficient light inside or outside, overall sentiment); and
- Insufficient privacy (no partitions, doors);
- Unable to keep warm or cool (no or dysfunctional temperature regulating devices, insufficient warm clothes).

Households were classified as having had issues related to the living conditions inside their shelter as soon as at least one of the options above was reported. The following (minor) deviations have to be taken into consideration:

- **Lebanon:** While in most contexts, households could report as many options as applied, in Lebanon, they could only report up to 3 issues. However, as all issues were equally considered for the analysis, the number of issues households could report is irrelevant.
- **Niger:** Also in Niger, households could report only up to 3 issues. However, as all issues were equally considered for the analysis, the number of issues households could report is irrelevant. Moreover, response options were formulated differently, but for the purpose of this analysis are considered to remain broadly comparable, speaking the same issues above (excluding personal hygiene, and with more options looking at whether or not people felt safe in the shelter), even though possibly in a more narrow sense, i.e. with some slight possibility for underestimation:
  - Les enfants doivent parfois aller dormir chez les voisins pour pouvoir respecter la séparation entre les filles et les garçons ;
  - Le ménage doit sortir pour emprunter de quoi faire la cuisine ;
  - Le ménage ne peut pas stocker de l'eau et/ou de la nourriture de manière adéquate dans l'abri ;
  - L'abri ne peut pas accueillir tous les membres du ménage en cas d'intempéries ;
  - Les membres du ménage ne se sentent pas en sécurité dans l'abri ; and
  - Manque d'intimité en raison d'un manque d'espace pour accueillir tous les membres du ménage ;
  - L'abri et les biens non-alimentaires ne suffisent pas à protéger les membres du ménage des intempéries (vagues de chaleur, fortes pluies, etc.).
- **Ukraine:** 'Unable to wash / dry clothes' was added as a response option. This is not considered to affect comparability, as only 1% of households reported this issue while not having reported any other issue. An inability to adequately perform personal hygiene was split into two options – in inability to adequately wash due to a lack of or unsafe facilities, and in inability to adequately perform general personal hygiene due to insufficient hygiene items. Such more nuanced response options are not considered to affect comparability neither, as all issues were considered equally.



## Health

### (a) Unmet health care needs

*% of individuals reportedly having had unmet health care needs in the 3 months prior to data collection / % of households with individuals reportedly having had unmet health care needs in the 3 months prior to data collection*

Most commonly, unmet health care needs were assessed through the following two questions asked for every individual in the household:

- (1) In the past 3 months, did [individual] have a health problem and needed to access health care?
- (2) [if yes] Was [individual] able to obtain the the health care they felt they needed?

An individual was considered to have had an unmet health care needs, if they had not been able to obtain the needed care; a met health care need if they had been able to obtain the needed care; and no health care needs if they had no health problem / did not need to access health care.

When interpreting the findings, the following deviations have to be taken into account:

- **Afghanistan, Niger:** Unmet health care needs were assessed at the household level, asking the questions above about 'any household member' at the same time. While thi is generally assumed to be comparable enough to the above questions for an analysis of unmet health care needs, met health care needs cannot be analysed in this case, as there is no information on how many household members might still have obtained health care, even if some did not. Neither can the individual-level indicator be calculated, as there is no information on how many individuals did not obtain health care.
- **Iraq, Libya:** Unmet health care needs were assessed at the household level, asking question (1) about 'any household members' and for question (2), assessing the number of individuals that were not able to obtain the care they needed. While this does allow to assess unmet health care needs, both at the household and at the individual level, with results assumed to remain comparable to those generated by the above questions, met health care needs cannot be analysed.
- **oPt:** Unmet health care needs were assessed following the above two questions at the individual level, if a previous household-level screening question on whether or not anyone in the household had needed health care had been answered affirmatively. This was not assumed to have any impact on comparability.
- **Somalia:** Instead of a 3-months recall period, the recall period in Somalia was 'since Eid-al-Fitr (May 2<sup>nd</sup>)'. With data collection having been conducted between mid-July and mid-August, this corresponds to a recall period of 2.5 to 3.5 months, such that results are assumed to remain broadly comparable.
- **Ukraine:** In Ukraine, after asking if household members had needed health care (question (1) above), and before asking if they were able to obtain the care they needed (question (2) above), respondents were asked if the household members having needed health care sought the desired services, and only if yes, they were asked if they obtained the needed care. While this introduces an additional filter, results are assumed to remain broadly comparable, because households not having sought health care despite having needed it, would automatically be assumed not to have obtained the needed care, while for those who sought health care, whether or not they obtained it, is based on their reporting. Thus, for all individuals having needed health care, met and unmet health care needs could still be assessed.

## (b) Self-reported barriers towards accessing health care

*% of households by self-reported barriers towards accessing health care in the 3 months prior to data collection*

Ideally, across contexts barriers towards accessing health care were accessed across all households, including:

- (1) Barriers experienced that prevented households from having accessed health care when they needed it (if at least one individual with an unmet health care needs was reported);
- (2) Barriers experienced when accessing health care (if all health care needs were met);
- (3) Barriers households would expect experiencing if they had to access health care (if no health care needs were reported).

When interpreting the findings, the following deviations have to be taken into account:

- **Afghanistan:** In Afghanistan, problems related to access to health care at the closest active health centre were assessed (without a recall period). Moreover, while in most contexts, households could report up to 3 barriers, in Afghanistan, they could report as many as applied. Generally, only asking about actual / experienced problems may lead to higher proportions of households not having reported problems relative to other contexts. At the same time, 82% of households had reportedly needed health care, and only 7% of households reported not having needed health care in response to the barriers question, such that the proportion to whom the hypothetical could have likely been relevant may be relatively small, and results remain broadly comparable. Not having had a recall period may further have led to some underreporting of barriers relative to other contexts, as the question might imply to only be referring to the current situation, rather than the past 3 months. Lastly, not having had a constraint on the number of responses does not affect comparability, as all barriers were equally considered.
- **Haiti:** The above three questions were implemented in such a way that the second question was asked to households with at least one individual with met health care needs (instead of households where all health care needs had reportedly been met), such that the first two questions were sometimes both asked to the same household. This was accounted for during the analysis, such that responses to the second question were only considered for households where all health care needs had been met.
- **Iraq:** In Iraq, difficulties encountered when attempting to access health services or treatment were assessed, with households being able to report as many barriers as applied. First, only asking about actual / experienced problems may lead to higher proportions of households not having reported problems relative to other contexts. At the same time, 76% of households had reportedly needed health care, and only 11% of households reported not having needed health care in response to the barriers question, such that the proportion to whom the hypothetical could have likely been relevant may be relatively small, and results remain broadly comparable. Secondly, not having had a constraint on the number of responses does not affect comparability, as all barriers were equally considered.
- **Mali:** In Mali, the second question above (for households where all health care needs were met) was asked to both households with met health care needs and households without health care needs. This may lead to a relative underestimation of barriers if households without health care needs did not consider hypothetical barriers they may be facing. However, while 33% of households reported not having had health care needs, only 4% of households reported not having needed health care when asked about barriers, such that the proportion to whom the



hypothetical could have likely been relevant may be relatively small, and results remain broadly comparable.

- **Ukraine:** Barriers were not assessed among households with household members having needed but not having sought health care. Thus, responses are biased towards households members having needed and sought health care (whether obtained or not), as well as households not having needed health care, while for 15% of households responses are missing.

## Education

### (a) Child enrolment in formal schooling

*% of households with school-aged children / % of school-aged household members reportedly not having been enrolled in formal schools during the 2021-2022 school year / % of households (out of all households – with or without school-aged children) reporting at least one school-aged child who was not enrolled in formal schools during the 2021-2022 school year*

Across contexts, school enrolment in formal schools during the 2021-2022 school year was either assessed for each school-aged individual separately, or at the household-level by age and sex group. The definition of school age varied by context but generally included individuals aged 5 / 6 to 17. Moreover, the definition of formal schooling varied by context. Details are provided in Table 8 below.

**Table 8** Context-specific aspects when assessing formal school enrolment

	Household / individual level	Age groups (primary / secondary)	Definitions of formal schooling and enrolment (as provided in the tool)	Other
AFG	Household	6-12 / 13-17	Formal schools are defined as schools within a system of full-time education developed by public organisations and recognised private bodies. This includes CBEs, madrassas, and traditional schools. Enrolment does not mean going physically to school (as schools were partially closed), but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.	A 6-months recall period was used. If a child was enrolled at some point during the 2021-2022 school year but dropped out more than 6 months prior to data collection, a relative overestimation of non-enrolment rates is possible. This applies to parts of the country where the school year runs from September to June (rather than from March to November).
BFA	Individual	6-12 / 13-17	L'éducation formelle concerne le Préscolaire, le Primaire, le Post-primaire, le Secondaire et le	NA

	Household / individual level	Age groups (primary / secondary)	Definitions of formal schooling and enrolment (as provided in the tool)	Other
			Supérieur. Elle prend en compte l'enseignement Franco-arabe. **Être inscrit** ne signifie pas aller physiquement à l'école mais que l'enfant était enregistré, affilié et inscrit auprès d'une école.	
CAR	Individual	6-12 / 13-17	Notes : 1) Cela ne signifie pas aller physiquement à l'école (car les écoles étaient partiellement fermées), mais que l'enfant était enregistré/affilié/inscrit auprès d'une école. 2) Les écoles formelles sont définies comme des écoles faisant partie d'un système d'enseignement à temps plein développé par des organisations publiques et des organismes privés reconnus. 3) S'ils ont abandonné en cours d'année, on veut quand même qu'ils soient comptés ici !	Including children that were enrolled at some point during the school but have dropped out since is specifically mentioned. This may lead to slightly lower non-enrolment rates being reported as compared to other contexts. However, results are considered to remain broadly cross-crisis comparable.
DRC	Household	6-11 / 12-17	Cela ne signifie pas que l'enfant allait physiquement à l'école (puisque les écoles pouvaient être partiellement fermées), mais que l'enfant était enregistré/inscrit dans une école formelle (cela inclut les **écoles publiques à temps plein** et les **écoles privées reconnues**).	NA
HTI	Individual	6-11 / 12-17	Cela peut-être l'enseignement pré-scolaire, fondamentale, secondaire, ou supérieur **Être inscrit** ne signifie pas aller physiquement à l'école mais que l'enfant était enregistré, affilié et inscrit auprès d'une école.	'Formal' schooling was not specifically defined. The question still specifically referred to 'formal' schooling, such that results are considered to remain comparable.
IRQ	Individual	6-12 / 13-17	This does not mean going physically to school as schools were partially closed, but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.	'Formal' schooling was not specifically defined. The question still specifically referred to 'formal' schooling, such that results are considered to remain comparable.
KEN	NA	NA	NA	NA

	Household / individual level	Age groups (primary / secondary)	Definitions of formal schooling and enrolment (as provided in the tool)	Other
LBN	Individual	6-12 / 13-17	<p>This does not mean going physically to school (as schools might have been partially closed), but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.</p> <p>This includes any enrolment in education that is institutionalized and planned through public schools and recognised private schools.</p>	NA
LBY	Household	6-14 / 15-17	<p>NOTE: This does not mean going physically to school (as schools might have been partially closed), but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.</p> <p>NOTE: This includes enrolment in either full-time public schools or recognised private schools.</p>	NA
MLI	Household	6-11 / 12-17	<p>remarque : cela ne signifie pas aller physiquement à l'école (car les écoles étaient partiellement fermées), mais que l'enfant était inscrit/affilié à une école. cela inclut l'inscription dans des écoles publiques à plein temps ou des écoles privées reconnues.</p>	NA
NER	NA	NA	NA	NA
OPT	Individual	5-10 / 11-17	<p>NOTE: this does not mean going physically to school (as schools were partially closed), but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.</p> <p>NOTE: This includes enrolment in either full-time public schools or recognised private schools.</p>	NA
SOM	Household	6-11 / 12-17	<p>NOTE: this does not mean going physically to school (as schools might have been partially closed), but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school.</p> <p>NOTE: This includes enrolment in either full-time public schools or recognised private schools.</p>	NA
UKR	Household	6-11 / 12-17	<p>NOTE: this does not mean going physically to school (as schools might have been partially closed),</p>	NA

Household / individual level	Age groups (primary / secondary)	Definitions of formal schooling and enrolment (as provided in the tool)	Other
		but that the child was registered/affiliated/'signed-up' with a school. NOTE: This includes enrolment in either full-time public schools or recognised private schools.	

## (b) Child attendance of formal schooling

*% of households with school-aged children / % of school-aged household members reportedly not having been enrolled or attending formal school regularly during the 2021-2022 school year / % of households (out of all households – with or without school-aged children) reporting at least one school-aged child who was not enrolled or did not attend formal school regularly during the 2021-2022 school year*

Across contexts, regular school attendance during the 2021-2022 school year was either assessed for each school-aged individual separately, or at the household-level by age and sex group (as shown in Table 8 above). Moreover, the same definitions of school age, as well as formal schooling, as shown in Table 8 above applied. Across contexts, 'regular' attendance was defined as children having attended formal school at least four days a week. Moreover, when interpreting the findings, the following has to be taken into consideration:

- **Skip logics / constraints:** While in most cases, school attendance was assessed based on previously reported school enrolment, in Mali, oPt, Somalia, and Ukraine, school attendance was assessed irrespective of enrolment. This means that in the latter cases, instances of children reportedly not having been enrolled but having attended are possible. While this may be possible, for reasons of consistency and comparability across contexts, non-enrolment was automatically counted as non-attendance, irrespective of actual reported attendance (and the indicator formulated as 'not having been enrolled or attended').
- **Afghanistan:** A 6-months recall period was used. If a child attended regularly in the 6 months prior to data collection while it did not in the 6 months prior to those, a relative underestimation of non-attendance rates is possible. This applies to parts of the country where the school year runs from September to June (rather than from March to November).
- **Kenya:** School attendance was assessed with reference to the 12 months prior to data collection, and for individuals aged 4 to 17 having attended either pre-primary, primary, or secondary school. The school year in Kenya being aligned with the calendar year, on the one hand, the 12 months recall period creates greater comparability with contexts where the school year runs from September to August (i.e. often roughly a 12 months recall period at the time of data collection). On the other hand, it spans two school years, which may impact comparability. The fact that school attendance for 4 to 17 year-olds as a single group was assessed, which does not allow to exclude pre-primary school-aged children from the analysis may lead to relatively higher non-attendance rates than in other contexts having been reported (assuming that pre-primary attendance is comparably low). Moreover, the question did not specifically refer to 'formal' schooling. However, given that the Kenya MSNA was conducted in a camp context, where access to education is therefore likely already less comparable to other contexts for contextual reasons, the results are still considered relevant and valid for this MSNA to be included in the analysis.

## Livelihoods

### (a) Income sources

*% of households by reported main income source(s)*

Reported household income sources were categorized into stable, seasonal / unstable, and 'emergency' income sources as shown in Table 9. It is important to note that due to the limited information available on income sources in each dataset, for the purpose of this analysis, this categorization was carried out based on the presumed stability of the reported sources of income under 'normal' conditions. The amount earned was not captured. Neither were any contextual factors, such as natural hazards or climatic events, that may have impacted the presumed stability of certain income sources in a given context considered in the analysis.

**Table 9** Income source categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

	Stable	Seasonal / unstable	'Emergency'
AFG	Small business Rent Formal employment	Daily labour- no contract Government benefits Gifts or remittances Agriculture Livestock	Humanitarian assistance Borrowing loans Selling household assets
BFA	Commerce (y compris immobilier) Petit commerce Fonctionnaires et/ou salariés (y compris pension) Professions libérales (avocats, notaires, etc.) Petits métiers (menuisier, maçons, plombier, tailleur, etc.) Transport (chauffeur, activités connexes)	Travail agricole journalier rémunéré (en nature ou en espèces) Travail journalier rémunéré non agricole Transferts d'argent (remittances) Transformation produits naturels/Exploitation/vente de la production minière Agriculture ou maraîchage et vente des produits d'agriculture Pêche, Chasse, Cueillette et vente des produits (miel, gibier, champignons, chenilles, etc.) Élevage et vente de produits d'élevage et de bétail (lait, œufs, volailles)	Aides/Dons sociaux (fait par la communauté/famille et/ou des tierces personnes) Aides/Dons humanitaire (fait par l'Etat ou des organisations) Vente de l'aide humanitaire Mendicité, Emprunts ou Dettes
CAR	Commerce / Petit commerce / Petits métiers (menuisier, maçons, plombier, tailleur, salon de coiffure, etc.) Travail salarié (y compris pension)	Travail journalier rémunéré agricole (en nature ou en espèces) Travail journalier rémunéré non agricole	Aucune Don humanitaire (fait par l'Etat ou des organisations) Mendicité, Emprunts ou Dettes Transferts d'argent/Aides/Dons sociaux (fait par la

	Stable	Seasonal / unstable	'Emergency'
	Transport (chauffeur, activités connexes)	Transformation produits naturels/Exploitation/vente de la production minière Agriculture ou maraîchage et vente des produits d'agriculture Pêche/Chasse/cueillette et vente des produits de la pêche/chasse/cueillette (miel, gibier, champignons, chenilles) Élevage et vente de produits d'élevage et de bétail (lait, œufs, volailles)	communauté/famille et/ou des tierces personnes
DRC	Petit commerce (y compris vente de braise/charbon, etc.) Travail permanent (contrat permanent) Artisanat	Travail journalier (contre salaire) Activités de chasse et de cueillette Exploitation minière artisanale Agriculture Pêche Elevage	Aide humanitaire Envois de fonds / dons de famille et/ou d'amis
HTI	Travail salarié Revenus de son propre commerce (hors production agricole)	Travail journalier non agricole Travail journalier agricole Travail informel Assistances ou prestations sociales gouvernementales Transferts monétaires par des proches Revenus issus de la production de charbon de bois Revenus issus de sa propre production agricole ou piscicole	Aucun Pas de sources de revenus ou pas d'autres sources de revenu Support par famille ou amis (à l'exclusion des transferts monétaires) Assistance humanitaire Charité (à l'exclusion de l'assistance humanitaire) Emprunt/dette
IRQ	Regular employment (private or public sector) Income from renting out house, land or property	Irregular employment (temporary or daily wage earning) Remittances MODM cash assistance Savings Social service (disability allowance) Retirement fund or pension	Selling assistance received Support from community, friends, family NGO or charity assistance Zakat Selling household assets Loans, debts
KEN	Salaried employment(either casual or regular) Self-employed	Remittance Selling of natural resources (charcoal, grass, firewood) Casual Labour(e.g kazi ya mkono)	Humanitarian assistance Sale of humanitarian assistance No access to income Allowance/ Support from the community, friends and family

	Stable	Seasonal / unstable	'Emergency'
		Government social benefits or assistance Agriculture(crop farming, bee keeping and livestock keeping)	
LBN	Employment (contracted) Self-employment (own business / family business) Income from renting out house, land or property	Daily/intermittent work International remittances Savings Social service (disability allowance) Retirement fund or pension Agriculture, livestock or herding	Loans, debt Selling assistance received Support from community Support from friends and/or family inside the country NGO/UN, governmental or charity assistance (including Zakat) Selling household assets Illegal or socially degrading activities (e.g. unlawful sales, begging, etc.)
LBV	Members of the household are working in permanent job with regularly paid wage	Members of the household are working without regularly paid wage or temporary job or daily labour Savings Remittances Government subsidies	Humanitarian assistance (including local charities) No income source Loans (formal or informal)
MLI	Commerce (y compris immobilier) Petit commerce Fonctionnaires et/ou salariés (y compris pension) Professions libérales (avocats, notaires, etc.) Petits métiers (menuisier, maçons, plombier, tailleur, etc.) Transport (chauffeur, activités connexes)	Travail agricole journalier rémunéré (en nature ou en espèces) Travail journalier rémunéré non agricole Transformation produits naturels/Exploitation/vente de la production minière Transferts d'argent (remittances) Agriculture ou maraîchage et vente des produits d'agriculture Pêche, Chasse, Cueillette et vente des produits (miel, gibier, champignons, chenilles, etc.) Élevage et vente de produits d'élevage et de bétail (lait, œufs, volailles)	Aides/Dons sociaux (fait par la communauté/famille et/ou des tierces personnes) Aides/Dons humanitaire (fait par l'Etat ou des organisations) Vente de l'aide humanitaire Mendicité, Emprunts ou Dettes Aucun
NER	Salarié/pension Commerce/entreprenariat Petit commerce/Artisanat (vente de biens)	Travail journalier non agricole (construction, brique, travaux de couture, etc)	Le ménage reçoit de l'argent de la part d'ONG (cash) Aucune/mendicité/maraboutage Envoi d'argent par des proches qui sont à l'intérieur du pays (migrants interne)

Stable		Seasonal / unstable	'Emergency'
OPT	Employment Self-employment (own business) Income from renting out house, land or property	Travail journalier agricole (défrichage, sarclage, semis, récolte, etc.) Envoi d'argent par des proches qui sont à l'extérieur du pays (migrants externe) Vente de bois Vente de bétail Vente de produits agricoles, de produits maraichers/irrigués	
		Remittances Social service (MOSD assistance) Savings Daily work Retirement fund or pension Work in Israel or the settlements Agriculture, livestock or herding	Selling assistance received Support from community, friends, family NGO or charity assistance Illegal or socially degrading activities (e.g. unlawful sales, begging, etc.) Zakat Loans, debt Selling household assets Cash assistance
		Casual labor Money sent by family/relatives Livestock sales Poultry / livestock products sales Farming or fishing products sales	NA
UKR	Regular employment (private or public sector) - salaried work Income from own business or commerce Income from renting out house, land or property	Irregular employment (temporary or daily wage earning) - casual or daily labour Remittances Government social benefits or assistance (e.g. disability allowance) Informal employment Pension	Support from community, friends, family (not including remittances) NGO or charity assistance Illegal or socially degrading activities (e.g. unlawful sales, begging) Selling household assets Loans, debts

**Additional notes:**

Ideally, households could report their three main income sources in the 30 days prior to data collection. However, when interpreting the findings, the following deviations from this approach have to be taken into consideration:

- **Afghanistan:** Only the primary and secondary source of income were assessed. Missing a potential third income source may affect comparability with the other contexts, in the sense that households with only seasonal / unstable or emergency sources of income may in reality also



have had a third stable or seasonal / unstable source of income. However, for the purpose of this analysis, results are considered to remain broadly cross-crisis comparable, as any third stable or unstable source is likely to have accounted only for a minor share of household income, if unstable / emergency sources were reported as the two primary sources of income. As such, the overall categorization obtained from the two primary sources is still considered to validly enough reflect households' overall situation.

- **Burkina Faso, Haiti:** A recall period of 3 months was used. It is possible that this may lead to a relative overestimation of the proportion of households with stable / unstable income sources, if they had those at some point within the 3 months prior to data collection but not within the 30 days prior to data collection. At the same time, results for Burkina Faso are similar to those for CAR, where a 30-day recall period was used, suggesting that the overall picture for Burkina Faso is valid if those two contexts are assumed to have broadly comparable livelihoods patterns. Results for Haiti are also similar to those for Burkina Faso and CAR. While Haiti may be slightly less comparable to these two contexts, overall livelihoods patterns (in terms of the reported combinations of livelihoods) still appeared similar, and therefore also results for Haiti are considered to remain valid and broadly cross-crisis comparable.
- **DRC, Niger:** Only the primary source of income was assessed. Looking at trends across contexts assumed to have comparable livelihoods patterns (Burkina Faso, CAR – compare Table 10), where the top 3 income sources were assessed, it is likely that a major share of households having reported a seasonal / unstable income source also had a stable income source (i.e. leading to an underestimation of the proportion of households with stable income sources), and that a larger share of those households in reality had multiple seasonal / unstable income sources than had only one.

**Table 10** Among households with a seasonal / unstable income source, % of households also having had a stable source, having had multiple seasonal / unstable sources, and having had only one seasonal / unstable source

	BFA	CAR
Seasonal / unstable AND stable	64%	63%
Multiple seasonal / unstable but NO stable	24%	27%
One seasonal / unstable and NO stable	12%	10%

- **Kenya, Lebanon, oPt, Ukraine:** Households could report as many income sources as applied. However, either no households (in Kenya, Lebanon, and oPt), or only 1% of households (in Ukraine), reported more than three income sources, such that results remain comparable to those of other contexts.
- **Libya:** Households were asked to report their main sources of income without any recall period. In the context of Libya where paid jobs but with irregular payment are common, this may lead to a relative overestimation of households reportedly having had a stable source of income if they had a paid job but were not necessarily paid in the 30 days prior to data collection. However, as in the context of this analysis, the stability of income sources was determined based on the sources' generally presumed stability and irrespective of amount earned, results remain comparable.
- **Mali:** Only the primary source of income was assessed. Looking at trends across contexts assumed to have comparable livelihoods patterns (Burkina Faso, CAR – compare Table 10), where the top 3 income sources were assessed, it is likely that a major share of households having reported a seasonal / unstable income source also had a stable income source (i.e. leading to an underestimation of the proportion of households with stable income sources), and that a larger share of those households had multiple seasonal / unstable income sources than had only one. Moreover, a 3-months recall period was used. It is possible that this may lead to a relative overestimation of the proportion of households with stable / unstable income sources,

if they had those at some point within the 3 months prior to data collection but not within the 30 days prior to data collection. At the same time, results are similar to those for Niger, where a 30-day recall period was used, suggesting that the overall picture for Mali is valid if those two contexts are assumed to have broadly comparable livelihoods patterns.

- Somalia:** Only the primary and secondary source of income were assessed. Missing a potential third income source may affect comparability with the other contexts, in the sense that households with only seasonal / unstable sources of income may in reality also have had a third stable or seasonal / unstable source of income. However, for the purpose of this analysis, results are considered to remain broadly cross-crisis comparable, as any third stable or unstable source is likely to have accounted only for a minor share of household income, if unstable / emergency sources were reported as the two primary sources of income. In addition, this limitation is only relevant for the 21% of households having reported multiple unstable sources of income. These households could in theory have had a third stable source of income, while for those that already reported a stable source of income, as well as those that reported only one seasonal / unstable source income (despite having had the possibility to report two sources of income), having had the possibility to report a third source cannot possibly change the results. As such, the overall categorization obtained from the two primary sources is still considered to validly enough reflect households' overall situation. Moreover, a 12-months recall period was used. It is possible that this may lead to a relative overestimation of the proportion of households with stable / unstable income sources, if they had those at some point within the 12 months prior to data collection but not within the 30 days prior to data collection. At the same time, the proportion of households having reported only one seasonal / unstable source is already so high that it is still considered likely more valid and valuable to include Somalia in the analysis than not including it. Lastly, none of the response options in the tool corresponded to 'emergency' sources of income. While this may have biased the recording of the responses, as the response option 'other' was included, households could in theory still have reported 'emergency' sources of income, such that there should be no major impact on comparability.

## (b) Livelihoods-based Coping Strategies Index

### *% of households having adopted livelihoods-based coping strategies*

For each context, reported livelihoods-based coping strategies were categorized into stress, crisis, and emergency strategies as shown in Table 11 below. To the degree possible, based on global recommendations / understanding, as well as in-country feedback, the inclusion of four stress, 3 crisis, and 3 emergency strategies was attempted. Where this was not possible for tool design reasons, deviations were accepted, however, and results considered to remain broadly cross-crisis comparable.

Livelihoods-based coping strategies reportedly adopted due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (Libya, Kenya, Ukraine), as well as livelihoods-based coping strategies reportedly adopted due to a lack of food or money to buy food (all other contexts) were equally considered, as they were considered to yield results comparable enough for the purpose of this analysis.

**Table 11** Livelihoods-based coping strategy categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

	Stress	Crisis	Emergency
AFG	Spent savings Sold household assets (radio, furniture, refrigerator,	Sold income generating equipment (ie productive assets) or means of transport	Sold house or land Begging or relying on charity Engage in extreme or high-risk activities

	Stress	Crisis	Emergency
	television, jewellery, clothes etc) Borrow food or money to buy food	Decreased expenditures on health, education etc Sent children to work outside home	
CAR	Vendre des actifs non productifs du ménage (radio, meubles, réfrigérateur, télévision, bijoux, etc.)(lire les options) Emprunter de la nourriture ou acheter de la nourriture à crédit (lire les options) Emprunter de l'argent (lire les options) Vendre plus d'animaux (non productifs) que d'habitude (lire les options)	Vendre des actifs productifs ou moyens de transport (matériel agricole, machine à coudre, brouette, vélo, voiture, etc.)(lire les options) Retirer les enfants de l'école (lire les options) Consommer des stocks de semences qui devaient être gardés pour la prochaine saison agricole (lire les options)	Vendre la maison, la parcelle de terrain ou le champ (lire les options) Vendre la dernière femelle d'un troupeau (lire les options) Un membre de la famille a dû s'engager dans des activités risquées ou illégales génératrices de revenus (vols, vente de la drogue, travail avec groupes armés, prostitution, etc.) (lire les options)
DRC	Vendre des actifs/ biens non-productifs du ménage (radio, meubles, réfrigérateur, télévision, bijoux, etc.) Dépense de l'épargne Emprunt d'argent / nourriture auprès d'un prêteur formel / d'une banque	Réduction des dépenses non alimentaires essentielles telles que l'éducation, la santé (y compris les médicaments). Retirer les enfants de l'école Vente des biens productifs ou des moyens de transport (machine à coudre, brouette, vélo, voiture, etc.)	Vente d'une maison ou d'un terrain Mendier Avoir recours à la prostitution
HTI	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il vendu des actifs non productifs du ménage (radio, meubles, réfrigérateur, télévision, bijoux, etc.) par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû réduire les dépenses non alimentaires essentielles telles que l'éducation, la santé par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ? Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il vendu des actifs productifs ou moyens de transport (matériel agricole, machine à coudre, brouette, vélo, voiture, etc.) par manque	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû s'engager dans des activités risquées ou illégales génératrices de revenus par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ? Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû mendier par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?

	<b>Stress</b>	<b>Crisis</b>	<b>Emergency</b>
	<p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû vendre plus d'animaux (non productifs) que d'habitude par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû emprunter de l'argent/nourriture à un prêteur officielle/banque par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû dépenser l'épargne par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>	<p>de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû retirer les enfants de l'école par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>	<p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû vendre la maison, la parcelle de terrain ou le champ par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>
IRQ	<p>Selling household properties (refrigerator, television, jewelry...)</p> <p>Buying food on credit or through borrowed money from relatives and friends</p> <p>Reducing expenditure on non-food items (health, education)</p>	<p>Selling means of transport (car, motorbike)</p> <p>Changing place of residence and accommodation to reduce expenses</p> <p>Children under 18 work to provide resources</p>	<p>Children dropout from school</p> <p>Engaging in high risk behaviour/activities</p> <p>Children or adult forcefully married</p>
KEN	<p>Sold household assets/goods (radio, furniture, refrigerator, television, jewellery, clothes etc.)</p>	<p>Sold productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, tools, wheelbarrow, bicycle, car, etc.)</p>	<p>Begged</p> <p>Sold last female animals</p> <p>Member of household returned to the country of origin or moved out of the camps</p>

	Stress	Crisis	Emergency
	Purchased food on credit or borrowed food Spent savings Borrowed money	Consumed seeds that were meant for planting during the next season Withdrew children from school	
LBN	In the last 30 days, did your household sold household goods (radio, furniture, television, jewelery) because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household spent some or all of your households savings because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household bought food on credit and/or borrowed money to purchase food because of a lack of food or money to buy food?	In the last 30 days, did your household sold productive assets and/or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, car, bicycle, livestock) because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household reduced non-food expenditures on education because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household reduced non-food expenditures on health because of a lack of food or money to buy food?	In the last 30 days, did your household sold house and/or land because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household members accepted high risk, dangerous or exploitative work because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household involved school-aged children in income generation of a lack of food or money to buy food?
LBY	Sell non-productive household assets or goods (TV, household appliance, furniture, gold, etc.) Spend savings Borrow money from others, or buy food items on credit Reduce expenditures on essential non-food items (water, hygiene items, etc.)	Sell productive household assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, car, etc.) Reduce expenses on health (including drugs)	Adult household members engage in risky, degrading or illegal income activities (e.g. theft, smuggling) Children (below 18 years) have to engage in income generating activities Beg and/or scavenge (ask strangers for money/food) Sell house or land
MLI	NA	NA	NA
NER	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû emprunter de l'argent ou des aliments auprès d'un prêteur ou d'une banque en raison	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû vendre des actifs ou des moyens de transport productif (machine à coudre, brouette, vélo, voiture, etc.) en raison d'un manque de nourriture ou d'un manque	Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il été obligé de vendre de manière non durable le bétail ou des femelles / les animaux restants en raison d'un manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?

Stress	Crisis	Emergency
<p>d'un manque de nourriture ou d'un manque d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il eu à dépenser ses économies du fait d'un manque de nourriture ou d'un manque d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû vendre les biens/équipements de la maison (radio, meubles, réfrigérateur, télévision, bijoux, etc.) par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû vendre plus de bétail que d'habitude pour cette période de l'année par manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>	<p>d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû retirer des enfants de l'école en raison d'un manque de nourriture ou d'un manque d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il dû réduire les dépenses non alimentaires en matière de santé et d'éducation en raison d'un manque de nourriture ou d'un manque d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>	<p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il été obligé de vendre une maison/un terrain en raison d'un manque d'argent ou d'un manque de nourriture pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p> <p>Au cours des 30 derniers jours, votre ménage a-t-il été obligé de mendier en raison d'un manque de nourriture ou d'argent pour acheter de la nourriture ?</p>
<p>OPT</p> <p>Purchased food/non-food on credit (incur debts) due to lack of food or money to buy it</p> <p>Borrowed money to cover food needs due to lack of food or money to buy it</p>	<p>Reduced expenses on health (including drugs) or education due to lack of food or money to buy it</p> <p>Sold productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, bicycle, car, etc.) due to lack of food or money to buy it</p>	<p>Children (under 15 years old) worked to contribute to household income (e.g. maid, casual labour) due to lack of food or money to buy it</p> <p>Begged and/or scavenged (asked strangers for money/food) due to lack of food or money to buy it</p> <p>Sold house or land due to lack of food or money to buy it</p>

	Stress	Crisis	Emergency
	Used life savings due to lack of food or money to buy it Sold household assets/goods (jewelry car,...etc.) due to lack of food or money to buy it	Moved to less expensive accommodation due to lack of food or money to buy it	
SOM	In the last 30 days, did your household borrow food or get help from a friend or relative because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household Purchase food with borrowed money because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household send household members to eat with neighbors because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household sell more livestock than usual for this time of year because of a lack of food or money to buy food?	In the last 30 days, did your household consume seed stock meant for next season or harvest crops that are not yet ready because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household reduced expenses on health (including drugs) and education because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household withdraw children from school because of a lack of food or money to buy food?	In the last 30 days, did your household send members (or whole household) out to displacement camps to receive food aid because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household sell the last female animals because of a lack of food or money to buy food? In the last 30 days, did your household had to beg because of a lack of food or money to buy food?
UKR	In the last 30 days, did your household spend savings due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)? In the last 30 days, did your household take on additional regular work (job) to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter,	In the last 30 days, did your household sell productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, bicycle, car, etc.) due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)? In the last 30 days, did your household reduce essential health expenditures (including drugs) due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education,	In the last 30 days, did your HH member(-s) move elsewhere in search of work due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)? In the last 30 days, did your household use degrading sources of income, illegal work, or high risk jobs due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?



Stress	Crisis	Emergency
<p>health, education, etc.)?</p> <p>In the last 30 days, did your household sell household assets/goods (radio/furniture/TV...) due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?</p> <p>In the last 30 days, did your household purchase food on credit or borrowed food due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?</p>	<p>fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?</p> <p>In the last 30 days, did your household send household members to eat/live with another family or friends or eat at a food bank/soup kitchen/collective centre distributing food due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?</p>	<p>In the last 30 days, did your household sell house or land due to a lack of resources to cover basic needs (such as food, shelter, health, education, fuel for heating, bottled water, etc.)?</p>

## Protection

In general, when interpreting protection-related findings, the possibility of underreporting of sensitive issues, such as those related to child protection or security concerns, has to be taken into consideration.

### (a) Separated children

*% of households reporting children not living in the household at the time of data collection*

In most contexts, separated children are not considered to be part of the households as per the household definition in the context of the assessment. Whether or not a household had separated children ('a child under the age of 18 currently not living in the household') is therefore assessed irrespective of reported household composition. Moreover, the following standard reasons for children having been separated are assessed:

- Married and left the house;
- Left the house to seek employment;
- Left the house to study;
- Left the house to engage with the army or armed groups;
- Kidnapped/abducted;
- Missing (left and no news); and



- Arbitrarily detained.

When interpreting the findings, the following deviations have to be taken into account, however:

- **Afghanistan:** In Afghanistan, separated children are considered to be part of the household as per the household definition. While this may have an impact on comparability related to other indicators, it does not affect comparability related to this indicator, as it is nevertheless assessed whether or not the household had separated children.
- **Burkina Faso:** Kidnapping by armed groups and kidnapping by other actors were considered as separate reasons. This does not affect comparability, as both options can be considered under 'kidnapping' in the sense of the reasons given above.
- **CAR:** Additional reasons for separation included: (1) Impossibilité financière de prise en charge de l'enfant (pas de ressources financières, pas espace dans notre abri) ; (2) A quitté la maison à cause de l'insécurité dans la zone où nous vivons ; (3) A quitté la maison pour rejoindre d'autres membres de la famille ; (4) S'est perdu pendant les déplacements. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis.
- **Haiti:** Additional reasons for separation included: (1) A été forcé de se marier / convivre avec un membre d'un groupe / gang armé ; (2) A été recruté par un groupe / gang armé. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis, while these two reasons relate to child marriage, as well as engagement with armed groups in the sense of the reasons given above.
- **Libya:** 'Living with other family members/ extended family' was included as an additional reason for separation. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis.
- **Niger:** Additional reasons for separation included: (1) L'enfant habite avec un autre membre de la famille ; (2) Séparé de la famille lors d'un déplacement/conflit. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis.
- **oPt:** Additional reasons for separation included: (1) Medical reason; (2) Living with relatives or extended family. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis.
- **Ukraine:** Additional reasons for separation included: (1) Child in state care institutions; (2) Child with foster family or kinship family or friends. This does not affect comparability, as any contextually relevant reasons could be considered during the analysis.

## (b) Child marriage

*% of households reporting at least one married child*

Child marriage was assessed either for each individual separately, or at the household level. Moreover, the minimum age below which child marriage was not assessed varied by context. While it is generally assumed that contextually appropriate thresholds were set below which this question is irrelevant to ask (i.e. assuming that it is very unlikely that children below a certain age would be married), a higher threshold may lead to relative underreporting of child marriage, compared to a lower threshold. In all cases, the upper threshold was set to 17 (Table 12).

**Table 12** Context-specific aspects when assessing child marriage

	Household / individual level	Age range	Other
AFG	NA	NA	NA

	Household / individual level	Age range	Other
BFA	Individual	12-17	Also included 'concubinage', which was considered equally to married
CAR	Household	6-17	NA
DRC	Household	6-17	NA
HTI	Household	<=17	NA
IRQ	Individual	12-17	NA
KEN	NA	NA	NA
LBN	Individual	9-17	NA
LBY	Household	<=17	NA
MLI	Individual	7-17	NA
NER	NA	NA	NA
OPT	Individual	15-17	NA
SOM	Household	3-17	NA
UKR	NA	NA	NA

### (c) Child labour

#### *% of households reporting children working outside the household*

Most commonly, children having worked outside the household in the 30 days prior to data collection were assessed. However, when interpreting the findings, the deviations from this approach outlined in Table 13 below have to be taken into account. Moreover, the minimum age below which child labour was not assessed varied by context. While it is generally assumed that contextually appropriate thresholds were set below which this question is irrelevant to ask (i.e. assuming that it is very unlikely that children below a certain age would be working), a higher threshold may lead to relative underreporting of child labour, compared to a lower threshold. In all cases, the upper threshold was set to 17 (Table 13).

**Table 13** Context-specific aspects when assessing child labour

	Recall period	Age range	Other
AFG	30 days	<=17	NA
BFA	NA	NA	NA
CAR	NA	NA	NA
DRC	30 days	<=17	NA
HTI	NA	NA	NA
IRQ	Currently	6-17	Whether or not individuals were working or contributing to household income at the time of data collection, as well as the type of work were assessed. The shorter recall period may lead to a relative underestimation of the prevalence of child labour. For the purpose of this analysis, the reported types of work were split into two categories: (1)

Recall period		Age range	Other
			Risky / socially degrading jobs: Non-structured: Selling chewing gum, plastic bags, water in the bazaar or on traffics. carrier in the bazaar; (2) Any other type of work: Structured: Serving in shops, Hotels, restaurant, making things; Family work: sewing, farming, shepherding, selling in a shop.
KEN	30 days	4-17	Children working in the following types of jobs were assessed: Permanent job with annual/monthly/weekly wage; Temporary job with weekly/daily/monthly wage; Daily labour; Other. While this is more specific, with the response option 'Other', this should still capture any children having worked outside the household, and therefore remain comparable to results of other contexts.
LBN	3 months	<=17	The longer recall period may lead to a relatively higher proportion of households reporting child labour (however, overall, <1% reported children engaged in employment outside the household). The question specifically asked if children were 'engaged in employment' (rather than 'working') outside the household. This may lead to a more narrow interpretation of the question and therefore lead to underreporting compared to other contexts.
LBY	NA	NA	NA
MLI	Currently	6-17	Whether or not individuals were working outside the household or contributing to household income at the time of data collection, as well as the type of work were assessed. The shorter recall period may lead to a relative underestimation of the prevalence of child labour. For the purpose of this analysis, the reported types of work were

Recall period		Age range	Other
			split into two categories: (1) Risky / socially degrading jobs: Carrière / Mines; Prostitution et autres formes d'exploitation sexuelle; Mendicité; Recrutés ou utilisés par des forces ou groupes armés; Artisanat (menuiserie, forge, soudure...); Construction / Bâtiment; (2) Any other type of work: Petit commerce; Restauration; Transport; Collecte de métaux; Agriculture/Travaux champêtres ; Pêche ; Elevage /chasse ; Travaux domestiques.
NER	NA	NA	NA
OPT	30 days	15-17	NA
SOM	30 days	<=17	NA
UKR	NA	NA	NA

#### (d) Security concerns

*% of households reporting security concerns*

Reported security concerns were grouped into very severe, severe, major, and none or only minor security concerns as follows:

**Table 14** Security concern categorization across contexts (as collected in each context)

Very severe		Severe	Major	None / only minor
AFG	Abduction, recruited into armed forces or groups, or detention	Attacks or harassment	Abuse or exploitation	None Movement restrictions (not COVID-19 related) Eviction from home
		Maiming or killing	Threats	
		Explosive hazards (mines, ERW, PPIEDs)	Violent destruction of property or farmland	
		Sexual abuse	Discrimination due to nationality, ethnicity, religion or association with any other social group	
		Were permanently separated from their parents	Denial of access to basic services	
		Maltreatment		
		Forced/Early marriage		

	Very severe	Severe	Major	None / only minor
			Had to work many hours affecting their well-being	
BFA	Oui, un enlèvement Oui, un assassinat Oui, enrôlement forcé, Oui, arrestation	Oui, de blessures graves pour cause d'accident ou de violence Oui, de tomber sur une mine Oui, mariage d'enfant Oui, violences sexuelles ou physique	Oui, vols, pillages	Oui, expropriation, éviction, Non
CAR	Recrutement forcé de la part de groupes armés Enlèvements / kidnapping – général Meurtre Traite/Trafic humain	Violences sexuelles Violences physiques / agressions de la part d'un membre de notre communauté (non sexuelle) Violences physiques / agressions de la part d'un membre d'autres communautés (non sexuelle) Violences physiques / agressions de la part des groupes armés (non sexuelle) Violences psychologiques, violences verbales Mariage forcé (contre sa volonté) Présence de restes explosifs de guerre dans notre communauté/village Mutilation génitale féminine	Pillage / criminalité Travail forcé (contre sa volonté) Menaces d'attaques Vol de bétail Harcèlement pour révéler des informations Dénis de ressources (accès aux soins de santé, à l'école, aux activités génératrices de revenus; héritage, etc.) Discrimination ou persécution à cause de l'ethnie, du statut de déplacement Discrimination ou persécution à cause de la situation d'handicap	Aucun Conflits fonciers (occupations secondaires de maisons/terres, ventes illégales de maisons/terres, destruction de maisons, évictions forcées, conflits fonciers avec voisins, conflits entre locataire et propriétaire) Incident causé par la transhumance Tomber malade et ne pas pouvoir être pris en charge Accouchement à domicile sans prise en charge
DRC	Enlèvement Être tué Être détenu	Harcèlement physique ou violence (non sexuel) Harcèlement verbal	Être volé Être menacé de violence	Aucun

	Very severe	Severe	Major	None / only minor
	Être recruté par des groupes armés	Être victime de harcèlement ou de violence sexuelle Mines ou explosifs (UXO) Mariage forcé Être blessé/tué par un risque d'explosion Mutilation génitale féminine (MGF) Être envoyé à l'étranger pour trouver du travail (for kids)	Discrimination ou persécution (en raison de l'origine ethnique, du statut, etc.) Être exploité (c'est-à-dire être engagé dans des formes de travail nuisibles pour le gain économique de l'exploiteur)	
HTI	Kidnapping Se faire tuer Détention Traite (recrutement et transport des personnes à des fins d'exploitation et détenues sous des prétextes trompeurs ou via l'usage de la force) Recrutement par un groupe armé / gang Utilisation des enfants par les gangs Détention à des fins d'exploitation sexuelle	Subir des violences ou du harcèlement physique (non sexuel) Subir du harcèlement verbal Subir du harcèlement ou de la violence sexuelle Mariage forcé Être blessé/tué par un engin explosif Mutilations Génitales Féminines Grossesse précoce Être envoyé à l'étranger pour trouver du travail (for kids)	Vol Menaces de violence Discrimination ou persécution (pour motifs ethniques, statut, etc.) Exploitation (être engagé dans des formes néfastes de travail à des fins économiques bénéfiques à l'exploitant) Déplacement forcé	Aucun Abus de substances (drogues, alcool) Accident Sorcellerie
IRQ	NA	NA	NA	NA

	Very severe	Severe	Major	None / only minor
KEN	Being kidnapped Being killed Being detained Being recruited by armed groups Unwarranted arrests by the police	Suffering from physical harassment or violence (not sexual) Suffering from verbal harassment Suffering from sexual harassment or violence Mine/ unexploded ordnances (UXOs) Being forcibly married Being injured/killed by an explosive hazard Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Being sent abroad to find work (for kids)	Being robbed Being threatened with violence Discrimination or persecution (because of ethnicity, status, etc.) Being exploited (i.e. being engaged in harmful forms of labor for economic gain of the exploiter) Theft in their shelter	None
LBN	Kidnapping	Suffering from physical harassment or violence (not sexual) Suffering from verbal harassment Suffering from sexual harassment or violence	Being robbed Being threatened with violence Discrimination or persecution (because of ethnicity, status, etc.) Discrimination or persecution (because of gender identity or sexual orientation) Extortion / bribery Confiscation of ID papers	None
LBY	Arrest or detention Kidnappings Trafficking in persons and/or exploitation (being	Armed clashes or presence of armed actors Explosive hazards Communal violence Verbal or psychological harassment Physical violence (not sexual and not conflict-related),	Robberies or theft Discrimination (in access to essential services and opportunities because of	None Cyber Harassment Risk of eviction Substance abuse Traffic accidents

	Very severe	Severe	Major	None / only minor
	engaged in harmful forms of labour for economic gain of the exploiter, including sexual exploitation) Association with armed groups	including killings, or threat thereof Domestic violence (violent or aggressive behaviour within the home, violent abuse of a spouse, partner or family member) or forced marriage Sexual harassment or violence Being separated from parents, relatives or legal guardians	reasons such as ethnicity, gender, disability, etc.) Forced return	
MLI	Enlèvement / kidnapping Traite ou trafic d'être humain Recrutement forcé	Meurtre et blessure Incidents et/ou Meurtre / blessure par un engin explosif / mine Violence psychologique/emotionnelle Violences sexuelles Mariage avant 18 ans (mariage précoce) / Mariage forcé (contre sa volonté) Séparation de la famille (for kids)	Déplacement forcé Vol, extorsion, pillage Menace Travail forcé (contre sa volonté) Deni d'accès aux services de base	Taxation illégale Conflits intercommunautaires Conflits fonciers Tensions entre communauté hôte / communauté déplacé
NER	NA	NA	NA	NA
OPT	Being kidnapped Being killed Being detained	Corporal punishment Suffering from physical harassment or violence (not sexual) Suffering from verbal harassment Suffering from sexual harassment or violence Mine/UXOs Being sexually exploited in exchange of humanitarian aid, goods, services, money or preference treatment Being married Being injured/killed by an explosive hazard Female genital mutilation Exposure to tear gas Settler violence	Begging Being robbed Being threatened with violence Discrimination or persecution (because of ethnicity, status, etc.) Being exploited (i.e. being engaged in harmful forms of labor for economic gain of the exploiter) Passing through checkpoints	None Bullying Cyber bullying/exploitation/violence Exposure to hazardous chemicals (e.g. pesticides) or substances (e.g. untreated sewage) Wildlife (e.g. scorpions or snakes) Unsafe transportation infrastructure or arrangements Electrical wiring or arrangements from lack of electricity (e.g. candle fires) Weather or climatic conditions Absent or distant medical treatment Difficulty understanding/complying



	Very severe	Severe	Major	None / only minor
				with directives from security forces/police/armed actors
SOM	Being kidnapped Being killed Being detained Being recruited by armed groups	Suffering from physical harassment or violence (not sexual) Suffering from verbal harassment Suffering from sexual harassment or violence Mine/UXOs Being forcibly married Being injured/killed by an explosive hazard Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Being sent abroad to find work (for kids)	Being robbed Being threatened with violence Discrimination or persecution (because of ethnicity, status, etc.) Being exploited (i.e. being engaged in harmful forms of labor for economic gain of the exploiter)	None
UKR	Being kidnapped Being killed Being detained Being recruited by armed forces	Being injured/killed by an explosive hazard (including mine / UXO) Suffering from physical harassment or violence (not sexual) Suffering from sexual harassment or violence Suffering from verbal harassment Suffering from economic violence Being injured Being sent abroad to work (for kids) Being separated from their caregivers	Being robbed Discrimination or persecution (because of ethnicity, status, etc.) Being exploited (i.e. being engaged in harmful forms of labor for economic gain of the exploiter)	None Being sent abroad for protection

When interpreting findings related to security concerns, also differences in recall periods, the population of concern, as well as the level (area or household level) at which the question was asked have to be taken into account (Table 15). Generally, longer recall periods may lead to more prevalent reports of security concerns, while a limited population of concern may lead to a lower prevalence. Lastly, household-level and area-level reporting may lead to differences in results, with area-level reporting generally assumed to lead to more prevalent reports of security concerns. At the same time, it is assumed that while households report more openly when asked about their area instead of about their household, the reports still essentially reflect household-level concerns. In order to increase comparability slightly, where questions were asked at the area level, responses were only considered from households with household members corresponding to the assessed populations of concern.

**Table 15** Context-specific aspects when assessing security concerns

Recall period		Population of concern	Household / area level
AFG	30 days	Men, women, girls, boys	Area-level concerns by household members
BFA	3 months	Household	Household
CAR	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	Area-level concerns and fear for the security of household members. Both questions were combined, such that area-level concerns for a population of concern were only considered, if the household feared for the security of the same population.
DRC	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	The questions were asked at the household level, with no skip logics, however. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
HTI	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
IRQ	NA	NA	NA
KEN	Current	Boys / men, girls / women	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
LBN	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
LBY	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	For men and women, the questions were asked at the household level, with no skip logics, however. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring. For girls and boys, the questions were asked at the area level. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the

Recall period		Population of concern	Household / area level
			population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
MLI	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	Household
NER	NA	NA	NA
OPT	Current	Women, girls, boys	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
SOM	Current	Men, women, girls, boys	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.
UKR	Current	Women, girls, boys	Area. Responses were only considered from households with household members of the population of concern to whom the reporting was referring.

### (e) Missing civil documentation

*% of households reporting at least one household member not having had valid civil documentation at the time of data collection*

Generally, it was assessed if all household members had civil documentation. The type of civil documentation that was considered varied by context, however. Moreover, while often it was specified that having civil documentation meant ‘having it, it being valid, and it being stored in a secure place’, this was not the case everywhere, which has to be taken into account when interpreting the findings (Table 16). It is possible that lack of this specification (or a reduced version of it, making the definition less strict) may lead to relatively lower proportions of household reporting missing civil documentation.

**Table 16** Context-specific aspects when assessing missing civil documentation

Type of documentation		Definition	Other
AFG	Tazkira, etc.	NA	The question was asked separately for male and female household members. This does not affect comparability, as it still captures all household members.
BFA	Extrait d’acte de naissance, carte nationale d’identité, passeport	NA (but physically having it was captured by the response options)	NA
CAR	Passeport, carte d’identité nationale en cours de validité,	NA (but physically having it and validity were captured by the response options)	NA

	Type of documentation	Definition	Other
	acte de naissance, carte d'électeurs		
DRC	Carte d'électeur, passeport, extrait de naissance	Cela veut dire que vous l'avez, qu'il est valide et qu'il est rangé dans un endroit sécurisé.	NA
HTI	NA	NA	NA
IRQ	National ID card or unified ID card, Nationality certificate or unified ID card, Birth certificate (only for household members under 18)	This means you have it, it is valid, and it is stored in a secure place.	The question was asked separately for household members below and above 18. This does not affect comparability, as it still captures all household members. Further, the possession of the different types of documents was assessed separately. The household was considered to have had documentation for each individual, as soon as one type of documentation was reported as available for each group.
KEN	NA	NA	Registration as asylum seekers or refugees in the camps, as well as challenges as a result of missing registration were assessed.
LBN	National ID, passport	This means you have it, it is valid and it is stored in a secure place. This does not include the civil registry.	NA
LBY	National ID card	This means you have it and it is valid.	
MLI	Extrait d'acte de naissance, carte d'identité, passeport	NA	
NER	NA	NA	NA
OPT	NA	NA	NA
SOM	National ID, passport	This means you have it, it is valid, and it is stored in a secure place.	
UKR	Natoinal ID/'Internal Passport' Tax ID Pension Card Birth Certificate Labour Book	NA	The relatively larger number of documents assessed may affect comparability in the sense that households may have reported documents as missing that might not be as relevant as those assessed in other contexts, i.e. leading to a relative overreporting of missing documents. However, overall,

Type of documentation	Definition	Other
		only 2% of households reported any missing documents, such that there is no major impact on comparability.

## Other

### (a) Self-reported priority needs

#### *% of households by self-reported priority needs*

Most commonly, households were asked about their top three priority needs. However, generally, different ways of asking, as well as some other context-specific aspects, have to be taken into account when interpreting the findings:

- **Burkina Faso, CAR, Lebanon, Mali:** While in most contexts, households were asked to report all their top priority needs at once, in these contexts, households were asked three separate questions for the first, second, and third priority need, respectively. For the purpose of this analysis, the answers to these questions were combined, such that a household was considered as having reported a specific priority need, if it had been reported on one of the three questions.
- **Kenya:** For some of the priority needs, response options were split by the preferred modality by which households would like this need to be met. For the purpose of this analysis, response options referring to the same priority need (but different modalities) were grouped, such that the proportion of households having reported this priority need, irrespective of preferred modality, was reflected. This was considered to render results more comparable to those of other contexts. The following broader categories were created:
  - Food: If households had reported at least one of the following: Food (in kind); Food voucher; Cash for food.
  - Shelter: If households had reported at least one of the following: Shelter materials; Cash for shelter; Shelter training.
  - Livelihoods: If households had reported at least one of the following: Unconditional cash; Vocational training; Livelihood cash.
- **Libya:** Access to cash, and employment (livelihood opportunities) or vocational training, were assessed as separate priority needs. For greater comparability with other contexts, they were merged into one category for the purpose of this analysis.
- **Somalia:** Households could report as many priority needs as applied. Since, however, for the purpose of this analysis, only the three most commonly reported priority needs were considered, this does not affect comparability.
- **Ukraine:** Households could report up to five priority needs. Since, however, for the purpose of this analysis, only the three most commonly reported priority needs were considered, this does not affect comparability. Moreover, priority need categories were often much more nuanced than in other contexts. For the purpose of this analysis, response options referring to the same broader category were grouped, in order to enhance comparability with other contexts. The following broader categories were created:
  - Health: If households had reported at least one of the following: Healthcare; Provision of medicines.

- Shelter: If households had reported at least one of the following: Provide accommodation; Rent support; Repair of inadequate/damaged accommodation.
- WASH: If households had reported at least one of the following: Hygiene NFIs (e.g. soap, sanitary pads); Wash facilities (repair / instalment of bathing, shower, toilet including hot water).
- NFIs: If households had reported at least one of the following: Baby products and/or baby food; Cooking facilities; Clothing (including winter clothes, coats, boots); Bedding / blankets.
- Fuel: If households had reported at least one of the following: Fuel for mechanics (e.g. petrol, diesel); Fuel for heating (e.g. wood, coal, kerosene).
- Livelihoods / cash: If households had reported at least one of the following: Livelihoods support / employment; Financial assistance to repay debt.