JOINT MULTI-SECTOR NEEDS ASSESSMENT (J-MSNA)

Food Security Sector

Sectoral preliminary findings, 13 October 2020
Refugee
Refugee – Food Consumption Score

% of households by **Food Consumption Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor (&lt;28)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline (28-42)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable (&gt;42)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Notable drop in FCS** as compared to the findings of the 2019 J-MSNA
- Households having **arrived at their shelter after February 2020** were found to be **significantly** more likely to have a poor FCS/ **significantly** less likely to have an acceptable FCS. Further, **households without an income** were found to be **significantly** more likely to have poor/borderline FCS/ **significantly** less likely to have an acceptable FCS.
Refugee – Food Sources

% of households reporting three main sources of food*

- Food assistance: 91%
- Purchase (cash): 60%
- Support from relatives/friends: 26%
- Purchase (credit): 13%
- Borrowing: 6%
- Army distributing food: 4%
- Barter and exchange: 4%
- Own production: 1%

*respondents could select multiple options

- 31% of households reported having gone into debt to buy food
- 3% paid only in cash
- 97% paid depending on food rations and/or friends/relatives
- 32% only received food assistance
Refugee – Food-based coping strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households reporting having adopted <strong>food-based coping strategies</strong>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred/cheaper food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce portion size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow food/rely on help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of meals a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict adults’ consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict men’s consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict women’s consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ respondents could select multiple options

- Households **without an adult male/male of working age** as well as those with **disabled household members** were found to be **significantly** more likely to report having adopted food-based coping strategies.
- Households that had **arrived at their shelter after February 2020** were found to be **significantly** less likely to report having adopted food-based coping strategies.

- **66%** of households reported **having reduced food expenditures** since the COVID-19 outbreak.
- **23%** of households reported **limited access to food** as an impact of the COVID-19 outbreak.
98% of households reported engaging in **coping mechanisms due to a lack of money to meet basic needs** during the 30 days prior to data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Mechanism</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent savings</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling labour in advance</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on food rations/community support as only food/income source</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying items on credit</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing essential non-food expenditures</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling, sharing, exchanging food rations</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing expenses on agricultural, livestock or fisheries inputs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling jewelry/gold</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling household goods</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling productive assets/means of transport</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of firewood for selling</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households **without an income** in the past 30 days and households **with adult males** were found to be significantly more likely to report having adopted emergency coping strategies. Red indicates emergency/crisis coping strategies employed in 2020.
% of households reporting problems, by problem*

Most shops are closed: 13%
Fear of increased police presence/checkpoints: 11%
Markets are too far: 8%
Transport is too expensive: 6%
Prices are too high/low purchasing power: 6%
Lack of transport: 6%
Fear of contracting COVID-19 at market: 6%
Shops have reduced opening hours: 6%
Shops have insufficient stocks of items: 5%
Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way to the market: 3%
Bad roads due to traffic/rough weather: 3%
Long waiting times/queues: 1%
Not COVID-related security concerns at the market: 1%
Women and girls are not allowed to go alone: 1%

*respondents could select up to 3 options

37% of households reported problems accessing markets.
Refugee – Communication with Communities & Accountability to Affected Populations

% of households reporting having received **enough information** on types of assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting **satisfaction** with types of assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Went well (post-lockdown)</th>
<th>Went well (pre-lockdown)</th>
<th>Did not go well (post-lockdown)</th>
<th>Did not go well (pre-lockdown)</th>
<th>Did not receive (post-lockdown)</th>
<th>Did not receive (pre-lockdown)</th>
<th>Don't know (post-lockdown)</th>
<th>Don't know (pre-lockdown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Livelihoods assistance was not assessed post-lockdown*
Refugee – Priority needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority need</th>
<th>% of Households Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter materials</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to income generating activities</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to safe and functional latrines</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household/cooking items</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean drinking water</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to education for children</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health services and or medicine</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to cash (excluding cash for work)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking fuel</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil documentation (identity cards)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents could select 3 options*
Refugee – Assistance Modality Preferences

% of households reporting **preferred modality to receive food assistance**

- In-kind assistance: 46%
- Cash assistance: 40%
- Vouchers: 5%
- Combination of cash/in-kind: 4%
- No preference: 5%
Host Community
Host Community – Food Consumption Score

% of households by Food Consumption Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor (&lt;28)</th>
<th>Borderline (28-42)</th>
<th>Acceptable (&gt;42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Notable drop in FCS as compared to the findings of the 2019 J-MSNA
**Host Community – Food Sources**

% of households reporting **three main sources of food**

- **Purchase (cash)**: 95%
- **Support from relatives/friends**: 28%
- **Purchase (credit)**: 23%
- **Borrowing**: 9%
- **Own production**: 8%
- **Food assistance**: 7%
- **Hunting/fishing**: 5%
- **Gathering of wild foods (plants/insects)**: 1%
- **Barter and exchange**: 1%
- **Army distributing food**: 1%

*respondents could select multiple options

- **43%** Cash only
- **50%** Depending on food rations and/or friends/relatives

- **42%** of households reported **having gone into debt to buy food**
- Households **without adult males** as well as those with **disabled members** were found to be **significantly** more likely to report relying on food rations and/or friends/relatives, while households with **secondary education or above** were found to be **significantly** less likely to report doing so
Host Community – Food-based coping strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strategy</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred/expensive food</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce portion size</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow food/rely on help</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of meals a day</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict women’s consumption</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict men’s consumption</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict adults’ consumption</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*respondents could select multiple options

- Households with a **disabled member** were found to be **significantly** more likely to report having adopted food-based coping strategies

- **78%** of households reported **having reduced food expenditures** since the COVID-19 outbreak
- **66%** of households reported **limited access to food** as an impact of the COVID-19 outbreak
KEY FINDINGS – Host Community – Coping

99% of households reported engaging in **coping mechanisms due to a lack of money to meet basic needs** during the 30 days prior to data collection.

- **Spent savings**
  - 2020: 51%
  - 2019: 39%

- **Borrowed money**
  - 2020: 56%
  - 2019: 29%

- **Buying items on credit**
  - 2020: 32%
  - 2019: 23%

- **Reducing essential non-food expenditures**
  - 2020: 29%
  - 2019: 8%

- **Selling productive assets/means of transport**
  - 2020: 17%
  - 2019: 8%

- **Selling jewelry/gold**
  - 2020: 13%
  - 2019: 8%

- **Reducing expenses on agricultural, livestock or fisheries inputs**
  - 2020: 10%
  - 2019: 4%

- **Selling labour in advance**
  - 2020: 9%
  - 2019: 4%

- **Selling household goods**
  - 2020: 5%
  - 2019: 8%

- **Collection of firewood for selling**
  - 2020: 3%
  - 2019: 1%

- **Depending on food rations/community support as only food/income source**
  - 2020: 2%
  - 2019: 0%

- **Selling non-food items that were provided as assistance**
  - 2020: 1%
  - 2019: 0%

- **Selling, sharing, exchanging food rations**
  - 2020: 0%
  - 2019: 1%

- **Begging**
  - 2020: 0%
  - 2019: 1%

**Households with adult males**, those with male working-age population* as well as large households** were found to be **significantly** less likely to report having adopted emergency coping strategies. Households with a **disabled household member** were found to be **significantly** more likely to report having adopted emergency coping strategies.

Red indicates emergency/crisis coping strategies employed in 2020.
Host Community – Market Access

76% of households reported problems accessing markets

% of households reporting problems, by problem*

- Prices are too high/low purchasing power: 26%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 at market: 22%
- Markets are too far: 22%
- Not COVID-related security concerns on the way to the market: 17%
- Fear of contracting COVID-19 on the way to the market: 17%
- Transport is too expensive: 17%
- Most shops are closed: 15%
- Lack of transport: 10%
- Shops have reduced opening hours: 9%
- Fear of increased police presence/checkpoints: 8%
- Not COVID-related security concerns at the market: 6%
- Shops have insufficient stocks of items: 4%
- Bad roads due to traffic/rough weather: 3%
- Women and girls are not allowed to go alone: 2%

*respondents could select up to 3 options

76% of households reported problems accessing markets.
83% of households reported at least one adult working.

Individuals working by age range:

- **Age 5-17**: 3% (2020) vs. 4% (2019)
- **Age 18-59**: 38% (2020) vs. 41% (2019)
- **Age 60+**: 19% (2020) vs. 20% (2019)

While the proportion of households with income-earners as well as the proportion of individuals earning an income remained comparable to 2019 results, 93% of households did report diminished/lost income as an impact of the COVID-19 outbreak.
Host Community – Income Sources

% of households reporting income sources*

- Labor or employment outside the camp: 59%
- Agricultural production and sales (including livestock): 25%
- Own business: 23%
- Borrowed money: 16%
- Assistance from relatives and friends: 12%
- Savings: 10%
- Labor or employment inside the camp: 7%
- Remittances from abroad: 4%
- Selling firewood: 2%
- Sales of household items: 1%
- Zakat: 1%
- Begging: 1%
- Borrowed money: 1%
- None: 1%

*respondents could select up to 3 options

- Households with adult males as well as those with secondary education and above were found to be significantly more likely to report employment/own business as a source of income
Host Community – Communication with Communities & Accountability to Affected Populations

% of households reporting having received **enough information** on types of assistance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting **satisfaction** with types of assistance **pre-lockdown***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihoods</th>
<th>Went well</th>
<th>Did not go well</th>
<th>Did not receive</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The approximate margin of error is +/-7%.

*Livelihoods assistance was not assessed post-lockdown; food assistance was not assessed. The approximate margin of error is +/-7%.
Host Community – Priority needs

% of households reporting priority needs*

- Access to food: 55%
- Access to cash (excluding cash for work): 54%
- Shelter materials: 40%
- Access to income generating activities: 30%
- Access to clean drinking water: 26%
- Access to safe and functional latrines: 19%
- Cooking fuel: 15%
- Access to health services and or medicine: 7%
- Access to education for children: 7%
- Electricity: 4%
- Household/cooking items: 3%
- Safety and security: 3%
- Other: 2%
- Support with providing feedback/complaints: 2%
- Civil documentation (identity cards): 1%

*respondents could select 3 options
Host Community – Assistance Modality Preferences

% of households reporting preferred modality to receive food assistance*

- Cash assistance: 54%
- Combination of cash/in-kind: 25%
- In-kind assistance: 18%
- No preference: 2%
Qualitative – Food Security & Livelihoods

Refugee

Impact of COVID-19 on needs:
• Quantity and quality of food reported to have decreased, while people’s ability to afford additional food has been extremely limited
• Support to elderly to access food distributions reported to have stopped by few key informants

Coping mechanisms:
• Reduced food expenditures
• Few people reported to have gone into debt with neighbors
• Few people reported to be selling assistance items – however, a reduction in the number of people selling food rations generally reported

Most vulnerable households:
• Households without an income/male family members

Host Community

Impact of COVID-19 on needs:
• Loss of income led to difficulties accessing food
• Food relief was widespread across the surveyed areas but generally perceived to have been insufficient

Coping mechanisms:
• Reliance on cheaper food, restricting consumption
• Reduced expenditures; in some cases, borrowing money

Most vulnerable households:
• Day laborers – however, regaining income may be more difficult for those who were previously employed and subsequently fired
• Families without men/relying solely on women’s income
Thank you very much for your attention!

Questions?