



**COX'S BAZAR
FOOD SECURITY
SECTOR**

Photo: World Vision / Xavier Sku

Cox's Bazar – Joint Monitoring Framework Analysis

Summary Report - 31 July 2020

Date of Analysis: July 28 2020 (Total Time – 3 hours) - Remote

Data Availability – In-country consolidation of reports in the [JMF Folder](#).

Organization	Number of Documents	Comment
World Bank	1	Labor in CXB
UNDP	5	District Development Plan
WHO	Many	Daily/Weekly/monthly updates
Food Security Sector	Many	Weekly updates from FSS
FAO	4	Reports on C19 impact on food and agriculture systems in CXB; policy guidance
WFP	6	Market Reports, REVA, Impact of COVID-19 on refugees and HC, Urban Assessment in Cox's Bazar
REACH	6	Market monitoring factsheets
ACAPS/NPM	15	Risk report, general reports

Participating Organizations (20+ participants)

- Food Security Sector
- WFP
- FAO
- UNICEF
- ACAPS
- UNHCR
- Population Council
- IOM
- BRAC
- ICCO Cooperation
- Shushilan
- Mukti
- Save the Children
- Transfers Working Group (Cash Working Group)

Analysis Areas (Determined by the JMF Team)

- Ukhiya - Rohingya Refugees
- Teknaf - Rohingya Refugees
- Ukhiya (Data Gaps)
- Teknaf
- Ramu (Data Gaps)
- Cox's Bazar Sadar
- Maheshkhali (Data Gaps)
- Chakaria (Data Gaps)
- Pekua (Data Gaps)

JMF Analysis Takeaways

Based on [analysis table](#) filled by JMF Team + discussions

- **COVID-19 Epidemiology**
 - o **Refugee Camps**
 - Somewhat low number of diagnosed COVID-19 cases have been reported in Ukhiya refugee camps. Low number of deaths. Low testing rate. Initiatives/campaign to increase testing by GoB and inter-sectoral (ISCG, CwCWG)
 - Health Sector and intersectoral initiatives set up in camps: Physical distancing measures (critical service mode, distribution guidelines) and contact tracing - in camps (quarantine, SARI, protect the elderly, HBC, etc.)
 - High number of deaths due to COVID-19 reported in Cox's Bazar Sadar (62% of all host community deaths in Cox's Bazar District).
 - o **Cox's Bazar Sadar (High Concern)** – Very high number of cases; urban/congested area
- **COVID-19 Secondary Effects**
 - o Containment measures have resulted in deterioration of overall health status – especially in camps, people's safety, access to education and increase in economic vulnerability.
 - o Intra-community interaction decreased due to restrictions because of COVID-19, however humanitarian assistance continues to have a positive impact on community interaction
 - o Restrictions on movement and travel were highlighted as the main concern by refugee and host community respondents
- **Additional Shocks/Stressors (Varying degrees of risk)**
 - o Monsoon flood (All Areas)
 - o Cyclone (All Areas)
 - o Landslide (All Areas)
 - o Deterioration of overall road conditions affecting food transportation (All Areas)
 - o Blockage of trade routes (All Areas)
 - o Drought (Teknaf)
 - o Salinity
- **Markets/Trade- Key Driver**
 - o Risk of losing IGAs (formal and informal) concern for all population groups
 - o Supply of fresh food items remain low, as local producers struggle to keep up with the demand.
 - o Refugee households' terms-of-trade remain significantly disadvantaged. Camp traders reported increased credit borrowing before partial opening of economy.
 - o **Teknaf and Ukhia (high exposure)** - Weekly wage rates (reported by daily and weekly laborers), both agricultural and non-agricultural work, decreased by 49% on average from pre-crisis rates reported in Mar-Aug 2019.
 - o **CXB Sadar, Ramu, Chakaria, and Pekua (Low exposure)**
 - CXB Sadar reported large decrease (72%) in wages due to lock downs (WB, panel survey) and 58 percent of the households had not received any income from their primary sources since April (data collected in early June). This could have an impact on the market fluctuations and vice versa (WFP urban vulnerability assessment).
 - o **DATA GAP in Upazilas outside of Ukhiya and Teknaf – information and data not available for household income and income sources**
- **Agro-Production (Outside Camps)**
 - o Restrictions on the movement resulted in supply chain disruptions which in turn led to unavailability of inputs (seeds, fish fingerlings, animal feed, etc.) and/or increase in prices of those inputs have negatively impacted farmers' fishery/livestock activities.
 - o Heavy seasonal rainfall have damaged crops and farmers are facing challenges due to shortage of seeds, seedlings and saplings.
 - o Immediate impact is more severe for high-value perishable commodities, which are often produced by smallholder farmers; the negative implications continue until now as farmers trying to restore the demand and struggle to find financial resources to procure required inputs for next winter growing season.
 - o Prolonged period of lockdown and fear of congregating disrupted the casual labour mobilization and led to labour shortages, thus depressing the crop/vegetable production as well as depriving migrant seasonal labour of income generation.

- **DATA GAP – Agro-production/livelihood engagement is limited to outside of camp (host communities) context, so information is missing about the camp situation**
- **Social Tensions/Conflict**
 - Reports of increased security issues in the camps due to increased intra-community tensions and limited humanitarian footprint.
 - People suspected of infection are highly stigmatized, leading to under-reporting of symptoms and social unrest
 - **Limited Tension reported in most areas – but mistrust between community, humanitarian actors and refugees reportedly increasing.**
 - **Teknaf - Inter-communal tensions increased more than usual.**
 - Limited information for host community areas
 - The COVID-19 exacerbated tension among host communities over access to natural resources in particular relevant for the forest dependent people impacting overall environmental depletion.
- **Food Security Outcomes, Coping and Humanitarian Assistance**
 - **Refugees** - No major change in households' sources of food was reported. Note – the lack of change is driven by the high reliance on general food assistance (blanket distribution for all refugees). Limited additional fresh foods and disruption of access to sources of income.
 - Ukhiya and Teknaf - Most host community households continue to rely on markets or grocery shops for food (60%), followed by assistance from humanitarian agencies and government (52%) (WFP, COVID-19 impact survey July 2020)

JMF Reported Changes to Humanitarian Assistance

Area	FSS	WASH	Health	Nutrition	Shelter/NFI
Ukhiya Rohingya Refugees	Food assistance to all households ensured*; decrease in self-reliance support	Large Increase	Increase	Normal	Increase
Teknaf Rohingya Refugees	Food assistance to all households ensured*; decrease in self-reliance support	Increase	Increase	Slight Decrease	Normal
Ukhiya	Large increase in food and cash for HC	Large Increase	Slight Increase	Slight Decrease	Normal
Teknaf	Large Increase	Large increase	Slight Increase	Large Decrease	Normal
Ramu	Increase	NA	NA	NA	NA
CXB Sadar	Increase	NA	Slight Increase	NA	Increase
Maheshkhali	Large Increase (No previous report)	NA	NA	NA	NA
Chakaria	Large Increase	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pekua	Large Increase	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kutubdia	Large Increase	NA	NA	NA	NA

*Modality of assistance was shifted from e-voucher to commodity voucher to mitigate COVID-19 risks. Variety of food items in the food basket decreased from 20 to 13 food items due to unavailability of certain items. However, the food basket was

nutritionally complete with increased quantity of each food item, and 1.25 kg of high energy biscuits were provided as a top-up to provide extra nutrition.

Highlighted or Flagged Areas¹

- Cox's Bazar Sadar – Highlighted Drivers
 - o Pronounced disproportionate disruption in livelihoods as reliance on non-agricultural livelihoods
 - o Vulnerability increased by two-fold
 - o Food expenditure halved
 - o Depletion of savings/buying food on credit reported (see recent assessment by VAM [here](#))
- Areas outside of camp with information gaps – Follow Up
 - o Ramu, Maheshkhali, Chakaria, Pekua, Kutubdia

Recommendations

- Improve data availability for areas with data gaps; host community outside of camp
- Build on knowledge collected by WFP urban assessment

Overview of JMF Process

Strengths - Multi-stakeholder engagement of Analysis/Data consolidation with low required follow up from R1WG. Identification/flagging of information gaps

Limitations - Recommendations are slightly high level and programmatic; unsure on next steps for follow up on data gaps

Aspects to address/improve-

- **Expected outcomes from analysis** - need to clarify from how JMF risk --> recommendations; identification of gaps; dissemination information
- **Area level Risk discussions** - analysis of components and drivers were good, but did not always reflect in final risk/recommendations
- **Distinguishing between usage of broad reports and regularly updated data** - when/how different sources of data can feed into the process
- **Clearer guidance on Food Security Risk** – Recent guidance notes have clarified the JMF definition and description of food security risk; however, CXB did not receive the fully updated explanation/PPT.
- **Improve circulation of JMF guidance for members not in webinar prior to analysis** - some members were not in webinar and brought up concerns about the process that could've been prevented. None of the comment derailed the conversation, but risk that people who are not familiar with the JMF but attend analysis could derail the conversation to a conceptual methods conversation and not analysis of risk.

JMF CXB included all steps of JMF Stage 2 - setting up JMF team, webinar/training, consolidating data sources, and risk analysis. The process was **relatively positive with no major bottlenecks or obstacles for setting up the analysis in CXB**. The FSL cluster led the process with CC managing the process and cluster IMO leading the IM process - delegating task as required.

CXB primarily focused on refugee v HC populations and was not able to apply risk to every analysis area - but did use the opportunity to highlight data gaps and flag areas for further information (Objective 2 of pilot). The analysis process included over 20 participants from over 14 different agencies

Setting Update JMF Process

The in-country team lead majority of the process to set up JMF process. R1WG supported indicator list revision and customizing JMF matrix. Data consolidated and entry steps were led by in-country team with minimal direct inputs on the matrix by experts and did not involve any support from R1WG. A meeting prior to the workshop was held to finalize comments and expected outcomes.

Analysis Workshop

Analysis workshop included wide range of members and was an active conversation with detailed discussion on the drivers of needs in CXB for the population groups. **The JMF matrix was filled out with relevant indicator data prior to the workshop and was reviewed/discussed by FPs/Experts**. Due to limited data availability for certain areas - the analysis workshop focused on the main population groups (refugees/HC) and covered about 6 of the areas proposed.

The analysis focused heavily on the JMF components with main discussion points on Markets, Agriculture, and HA. Discussion on the area level was limited due to time - potential need to provide guidance on structuring the analysis

¹ No areas are flagged for monitoring at this time

process/time. Recommendations tended to lean towards broad programmatic ideas - but the team did highlight detailed information gaps for both type of data and locations.

Data Availability and JMF Matrix

For the locations with data, a total, data sources from 8 different organizations were used in the JMF Table for 11 locations - information per area varied - World Bank, UNDP, WHO, Food Security Sector, FAO, WFP, REACH, ACAPS/NPM. All data was stored online and accessible for all members (via google drive folder [JMF CXB Data](#)). The JMF Table was completed prior to the workshop, available online, accessible for all members during the analysis (via google drive folder: [JMF Matrix CXB](#))

JMF Risk Analysis

Analysis/Discussion focused on JMF components and less on the overall area. The discussion was often critical and highlighted the linkages between events/drivers and likely impact on food security; however the documentation highlights more descriptive comments (probably because this was filled out prior to analysis).

The team highlighted risk associated with each component to gauge overall risk (a step we originally suggested but then removed). Due to time spent on analysis of each component - the discussion on area level risk was very limited and no clear conclusions were made; instead moved almost straight to recommendations. The components discussion highlighted which areas were more concerning and why – with less emphasis on discussions for each area, due to relatively small size of the analysis areas. **Overall, a positive analysis session, which followed the JMF approach – areas to improve include the overall approach for area level risk categorization. Providing clearer guidance/support on linking components to risk could support.**

JMF Recommendations

Recommendations tended to be high level programmatic recommendations – reduced focus on or flagging areas for monitoring. However, **improving data collection coordination through identifying information gaps was a key recommendation** with steps to build on the JMF assessment repository and indicator table to guide partners on assessment priorities. For areas with sufficient data - recommendations were programmatic and linked to addressing the drivers identified. No clear recommendations for monitoring - although no areas were flagged for v. High and in need for regular monitoring. Data for key drivers (income/prices/ToT) were also highlighted.