Summary findings

Do you feel informed about the kind of aid available to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly yes</th>
<th>Yes completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=934</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.7

Does the aid you receive currently cover your most important needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly yes</th>
<th>Yes completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=940</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.0

Does aid go to those who need it most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly yes</th>
<th>Yes completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=926</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.5

Have you been selling your aid items to meet your needs in cash?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=935</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you send your children to any education classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=900</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you satisfied with the education provided to your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 4.1

Are you satisfied with the cash support that you receive?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not very</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 4.1

*This question was only asked to those who said they receive cash support.

This thematic bulletin on needs and services presents findings and recommendations based on Ground Truth Solutions’ (GTS) surveys conducted with 943 Rohingya in Bangladesh. The survey, carried out in October 2018, was administered in 24 collective sites in the Ukhiya and Teknaf subdistricts. It is the second round of data collection, with the first taking place in July 2018. The goal is to use the views of affected people to inform humanitarian response and adjust programming accordingly. GTS will continue to track how these perceptions evolve over time, with the next survey round scheduled for spring 2019.

GTS will publish four bulletins from the second round of data collection on the Rohingya response: two more addressing Rohingya perspectives on feedback and relationships and safety and outlook; and one on social cohesion, which will include the views of both Rohingya and host community. Separately, there will be dedicated reporting on the views of the host community, which will cover their perceptions on issues such as needs and safety.

Trend in mean scores since July

* Increase in mean score of 0.5 or more
* Increase in mean score of less than 0.5
* No change in mean score
* Decrease in mean score of less than 0.5
* Decrease in mean score of 0.5 or more
Most important unmet needs n=473

55% Energy (259)
52% Cash (244)
33% Food security/food assistance (155)
29% Water, sanitation and hygiene (135)

Key takeaways

Two-thirds of Rohingya surveyed feel informed about the aid available to them. Awareness is particularly high in Kutupalong RC, where 87% report feeling informed about available aid, but lower among those living in Camp 8W, 14 and 22 (Unchiprang), where between 40% and 50% feel informed. Of those who feel uninformed, most want more information on aid distributions.

Half of Rohingya surveyed do not feel the aid they receive covers their basic needs. Those living in Camp 5 feel least able to cover their needs with the services and support they receive. Similar to the findings in the latest issue of What Matters?, it appears the most pressing unmet needs are energy, such as lighting and fuel, as well as cash. Our previous survey showed the need for cash and recommended an increase in cash-based aid, yet Rohingya respondents recorded no increase. Those who do receive cash, however, are very satisfied with it. Women report receiving less cash support than men.

Forty-four percent of Rohingya surveyed report selling the aid items they receive in order to better meet their needs. This is similar to the last survey in July, when 43% reported selling aid items. Selling aid seems to be most common in Camp 2E, Camp 1E and Camp 22 (Unchiprang), where 71%, 69% and 66% report selling aid, respectively. The majority use the cash to buy food items, including fish, meat, vegetables, chilli and salt. While some people receive food support via e-vouchers, allowing for some choice and diversity, there are still large numbers resorting to selling aid items in order to meet their food needs. Personal items, such as jewellery, are often sold for cash, which is only a short-term solution until such assets run out. People most commonly use the money to buy firewood, medicine and cooking fuel.

Fifty-seven percent of Rohingya surveyed think that aid goes to those that need it most, with particularly positive perceptions in Camp 23 (Shamlapur), where this number rises to 89%. Those in Camp 27 (Jadimura), are far more sceptical about the fairness of aid distributions, with only 20% believing support goes to those most in need. Forty percent of Rohingya living in female-headed households do not believe the aid distributions are going to those most in need, compared to 19% of those in multiple-headed households and 22% in solely male-headed households.

Items bought with cash from selling aid n=409

87% Food (356)
48% Firewood (195)
30% Medicine (122)
27% Cooking fuel (111)
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Most people who think aid distribution fails to reach those most in need report that people with illnesses or chronic diseases miss out, as well as older persons and widows or divorcees. There is also a sense that aid providers overlook orphans and people with disabilities.

Most respondents have children and 96% are able to send them to education classes, a modest but positive increase from 89% in July. While this may seem positive, this is inconsistent with lower reported attendance rates in the Joint Education Needs Assessment. They found that only 57% of girls and 60% of boys have attended learning centres. Parents prefer educational programmes held in schools or madrassas; education in Temporary Learning Centres or child-friendly spaces are less popular. Satisfaction with the education provided to children has increased notably from 55% in July to 88% in October.

Recommendations

1. The growing demand for cash, as also identified in the round 1 report, should be responded to swiftly. Given the limitations on cash programming imposed by the Bangladeshi Government, this should be accompanied by sufficient advocacy at a policy level. The proportion of respondents preferring cash over in-kind support, as well as the numbers of people selling the aid they are given, does suggest that blanket distributions alone are no longer sufficient and cash would be a complementary delivery mechanism. That said, while 97% have access to a market, for cash programming to be successful, extra support is needed for traders to accommodate any resulting increases in demand. Livelihood programming or loans targeting traders could help plug that gap. For example, several respondents requested sewing machines to support small trading opportunities. For more on supporting self-reliance through livelihood programming, see the Safety and outlook bulletin.

2. While cash programming has the power to be transformative, agencies must ensure that women are sufficiently covered by it. There have been concerns that women are being sidelined in the limited cash programmes offered. In fact, a focus on gender inclusivity should be applied to all programming, from female-only distribution lines to more women-friendly spaces. There should be particular attempts to target women who do not leave their shelter as often. Supporting mobile women’s groups in each camp could serve as an alternative to safe spaces for information dissemination and for hearing the voices of all women.

3. Revisit the essential items being distributed to ensure basic shelter needs are met. This should begin with thorough community consultations and would be important ahead of the next rainy season or cyclone period. It is also important to address energy needs, which were flagged as the most pressing unmet need. As the Safety and outlook bulletin outlines, however, it best to avoid firewood as this is a serious safety concern in the shelters. Rather, 85% of respondents would prefer gas as their main energy source.

4. There is still some way to go in making people aware of the different aid available. There should be a concerted effort to increase awareness and any relevant entitlement criteria made clear to all Rohingya. Relatedly, there remain concerns that vulnerable groups are still missed by aid distributions. Using porters, through a simple cash-for-work scheme, could help deliver basic aid provisions to those unable to attend distribution points.
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Demographics

943 Rohingya respondents

Gender

- Male: 56% (524)
- Female: 44% (419)

Head of household

- Multiple-headed: 40% (381)
- Female-headed: 15% (146)
- Male-headed: 44% (416)

Age (years)

- 18-30: 45% (426)
- 31-40: 25% (232)
- 41-85: 30% (285)

Location

- Kutupalong expansion site*: 51% (485)
- Camps 14, 15, 16: 15% (144)
- Camps 21, 22, 23: 13% (127)
- Camps 24, 26, 27: 13% (119)
- Kutupalong & Nayapara RC: 7% (68)

*Camps 1E, 2E, 2W, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8W, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20 ext

Respondents with a disability

- No: 91% (854)
- Yes: 9% (89)
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Ground Truth Solutions is an international non-governmental organisation that provides the humanitarian sector with tools to systematically listen, learn, and act on the views of affected people. Our goal is to make the perceptions of affected people the touchstone and driver of humanitarian effectiveness.

For more information about GTS surveys in Bangladesh, please contact Kai Hopkins (kai@groundtruthsolutions.org) or Rebecca Hetzer (rebecca@groundtruthsolutions.org).

The majority of questions are closed and use a 1-5 Likert scale to quantify answers. All data were analysed according to demographic variables and disaggregated by gender, age, location, date of arrival in camps, disability and gender of the head of household. Where considerable, these differences are mentioned in the text. The surveys were conducted by trained IOM Needs and Population Monitoring enumerators who speak Bengali and Chittagong, and who received Rohingya language training from Translators without Borders. Data was collected using a random sampling strategy between 24–31 October. The survey data was supplemented by Key Informant Interviews (KII) among humanitarian agencies.