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Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province. A sample of 3195 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 2% margin of error.

A sample of 3195 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 2% margin of error.

Demographics

Household composition by gender and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>60+ years</th>
<th>18–59 years</th>
<th>13–17 years</th>
<th>6–12 years</th>
<th>1–5 years</th>
<th>&lt;1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an average of 5 individuals reported per household

Head of Household

- 12% of heads of households were female
- 15% of heads of households were elderly
- 47 average age of the head of household in years

Dependency ratio

- 0.7 average youth dependency ratio
- 0.2 average elderly dependency ratio
- 0.9 average age-dependency ratio

% of households by current living location:

- 100% Own home
- 0% Shelter next to original home
- 0% Renting (non-displaced)
- 0% Renting (displaced)
- 0% Staying in another home that is not their own
- 0% Informal settlement
- 0% Other

2. The boundaries and names used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by REACH, UNICEF, HFI, or UNISMUH. Population data was extracted at desa-level from SIAK (Population Information Administration System) database, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA, 2017). Population of missing desas was imputed using data from the Indonesia Bureau of Statistics, 2010.
3. Respondent metadata provides information on the respondents interviewed for the questionnaire. While the respondent was usually the head of household, if the head of household was not present at the time of interview, a member of the household knowledgeable about household affairs responded instead. This section only shows information on respondents, not the heads of household. Results in this section are not weighted by population, and should be considered as indicative.
4. Age-dependency ratio was calculated by dividing the number of under-age and elderly (non-productive) individuals (0–17 years for youth and 60+ years for elderly) by the number of adult (productive) individuals in the population (18–59 years). Anything below 1 shows that the population is mostly adults of working-age who can provide for those who are not.
5. Households were categorised based on whether they were still living on their original land, or if they were displaced by the disaster. Those living in their original home, renting (in the same location both before and after the disaster) or living in a tent/makeshift shelter next to their
## Displacement and Protection

### Non-displaced population

6% of non-displaced households were hosting at least one displaced household in a house that they own.

There is an average of 3 IDP individuals in each displaced household hosted by a non-displaced household.

0.6 average dependency ratio of displaced household size to hosting household size for non-displaced households hosting IDPs.

### Movement intentions in the next 6 months

% of households by where they most want to move to within the next six months:

- Remain in the current location: 97%
- Move to a new location: 1%
- Move into the Government Transitional Shelter: 1%

### Top 3 most reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:

1. Heavy damage to house: 48%
2. Fear that land is still unsafe: 41%
3. Mild damage to house: 30%

## Shelter

### Shelter conditions

% of households by type of shelter they are currently living in at the time of data collection:

- 99% House
- 0% Apartment
- 0% Transitional shelter (individual)
- 1% Makeshift Shelter
- 0% Tent
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

59% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

% of households by state of tenure for house at the time of data collection:

- 44% Household owns the land
- 11% Written agreement (still valid)
- 2% Written agreement (expired)
- 43% Verbal/no agreement
- 0% Don’t know

2% of households reported that they were at risk of being forced to leave where they were staying at the time of data collection.

## Protection of Women’s Needs

14% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

## Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities

3% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability.

## Child Protection

3% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver.

## Psychosocial Support

47% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

---

6. Dependency ratio is calculated by dividing the number of IDP individuals being hosted by the total size of the host household. The number shows the relative burden that hosting households have to support IDP households.

7. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.

8. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

9. In many households in Central Sulawesi, there is a cultural practice in which a specific household owns many plots of land, and other households are permitted to live on it without any formal agreement.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:10

1. Request from owner of land 56%
2. Request from authorities 40%
3. Don’t know 8%

2% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

69% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:11

1. Assistance to build/repair shelter 54%
2. Shelter building materials 46%
3. None 21%

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):11

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; 56%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); 47%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats 33%

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Access to Water

% of households acquired most of their drinking water from the following sources:

- Piped water 30%
- Public tap 28%
- Protected well/spring 14%
- Water tank/trucking 1%
- Bottled water 20%
- Unprotected source 6%
- Don’t know 1%

95% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

90% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

- Water source located on site 85%
- Less than 10 minutes 9%
- 10–20 minutes 4%
- More than 20 minutes 2%
- Don’t know 0%

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet 61%
- Basin/bucket 32%
- No device 7%
- Don’t know 0%

93% of households have water available for hand washing.

65% of households have soap available for hand washing.

Sanitation conditions

% of households by most common defecation practice:

- Household latrine/toilet 80%
- Communal latrine/toilet 10%
- Open defecation 8%
- Don’t know 2%

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

- Flush toilet 100%
- Other 0%

10. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
11. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
12. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water town the toilet to cause it to flush manually.
There is an average of 8 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine\(^{13}\)

**Communal latrine conditions**

- 83% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting
- 3% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women
- 76% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors

**Waste disposal**

- 13% of households by reported main method of garbage disposal: Bin in household / street
- 2% Bury garbage
- 50% Burn garbage
- 24% Open area designated for waste
- 11% Open area not designated for waste
- 0% Other

**Food Security**

- Food Consumption Score\(^{16}\) average rCSI score\(^{17}\)
  - 90% Acceptable
  - 9% Borderline
  - 1% Poor

  **Reported Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)**

  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Score(^{16})</th>
<th>average rCSI score(^{17})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economy**

**Occupation and employment**

Main occupation of the household reported by households before the disaster and in the last month:\(^{14}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owner</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government job</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.

\(^{14}\) Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.

\(^{15}\) Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.

\(^{16}\) FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).

\(^{17}\) rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household adopted different coping strategies to make food last longer. The number of days was then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
% of households per main reported source of food in week prior to data collection:18

- Purchased with own cash: 94%
- Own production (hunting, fishing, farming): 2%
- Gift from family or friends: 1%

### Education

#### Student attendance

3% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster.

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school.

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school:19

1. School damaged/destroyed: 35%
2. Fear of school collapsing: 20%
3. Child not attending school before disaster: 15%

#### Condition of school facilities

% of households reported the condition of the nearby school to be the following:

- Good condition: 22%
- Lightly damaged: 28%
- Moderately damaged: 27%
- Severe damage: 10%
- Don't know: 11%
- Other: 2%

### Health

#### Immunization

16% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

#### Illness and injury

37% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 types of health concerns reported by households with a member who had suffered from health issues in the 30 days prior to data collection:19

1. Fever: 51%
2. Coughing: 49%
3. Diarrheal diseases: 21%

Main barriers to accessing healthcare reported by households who had needed to access medical treatment the 30 days prior to data collection:19

- No issues: 79%
- Cost of medicine/treatment too high: 10%
- Don't know: 2%

Main reasons (if any) that households have had to access health services in the 30 days prior to data collection:20

1. None: 40%
2. Get regular medications: 39%
3. Treat health problems: 35%

#### Priority Needs

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households:20

1. Food: 76%
2. Kitchen ware: 38%
3. Water: 24%

### Communication with Communities

#### Information Needs

% of households by the type of information that the household reported needing the most:18

- Humanitarian assistance: 34%
- Livelihoods: 23%
- Status of housing: 15%

18. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
19. Respondents could select multiple responses, therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
20. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
% of households by most preferred source from which they would like to receive new information:\textsuperscript{21}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face communication</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanitarian assistance

24\% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received:\textsuperscript{22}

1. Food 90\%
2. Tents 16\%
3. Water 15\%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:\textsuperscript{23}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government distribution</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO distribution</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Company</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72\% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days:\textsuperscript{23}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity not enough</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid received is not useful</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21} Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
\textsuperscript{22} Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
\textsuperscript{23} Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province.

A sample of 233 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error.

There was an average of 5 individuals reported per household

- 6% of heads of households were female
- 12% of heads of households were elderly
- 47% average age of the head of household in years

Dependency ratio:
- 0.8 average youth dependency ratio
- 0.2 average elderly dependency ratio
- 0.9 average age-dependency ratio

% of households by current living location:
- 100% Own home
- 0% Shelter next to original home
- 0% Renting (non-displaced)
- 0% Renting (displaced)
- 0% Staying in another home that is not their own
- 0% Informal settlement
- 0% Other

Respondent metadata:
- 233 Total households interviewed
- 46 Average age of respondent in years
- 46% of respondents were female

2. The boundaries and names used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by REACH, UNICEF, HFI, or UNISMUH. Population data was extracted at desa-level from SIAK (Population Information Administration System) database, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA, 2017). Population of missing desas was imputed using data from the Indonesia Bureau of Statistics, 2010.
3. Respondent metadata provides information on the respondents interviewed for the questionnaire. While the respondent was usually the head of household, if the head of household was not present at the time of interview, a member of the household knowledgeable about household affairs responded instead. This section only shows information on respondents, not the heads of household. Results in this section are not weighted by population, and should be considered as indicative.
4. Age-dependency ratio was calculated by dividing the number of under-age and elderly (non-productive) individuals (0–17 years for youth and 60+ years for elderly) by the number of adult (productive) individuals in the population (18–59 years). Anything below 1 shows that the population is mostly adults of working-age who can provide for those who are not.
5. Households were categorised based on whether they were still living on their original land, or if they were displaced by the disaster. Those living in their original home, renting (in the same location both before and after the disaster) or living in a tent/makeshift shelter next to their
Displacement and Protection

Non-displaced population

- 9% of non-displaced households were hosting at least one displaced household in a house that they own.
- There is an average of 4 IDP individuals in each displaced household hosted by a non-displaced household.
- The average dependency ratio of displaced household size to hosting household size for non-displaced households hosting IDPs is 0.8.

Movement intentions in the next 6 months

- 70% of households want to remain in the current location.
- 16% of households plan to move to the Government Transitional Shelter.
- 10% of households do not know where they want to move.

Top 3 most reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:

1. Heavy damage to house (86%)
2. Mild damage to house (17%)
3. Fear that house is still unsafe (16%)

Shelter

Shelter conditions

- 0% of households are living in a House.
- 0% are living in an Apartment.
- 9% are living in a Transitional shelter (individual).
- 12% are living in Makeshift Shelter.
- 79% are living in a Tent.
- 0% do not know what type of shelter they are living in.
- 0% are living in Other types of shelter.

- 96% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

% of households by state of tenure for house at the time of data collection:

- 44% owns the land.
- 3% have a written agreement (still valid).
- 0% have a written agreement (expired).
- 53% have a verbal/no agreement.
- 0% do not know.

- 4% of households reported that they were at risk of being forced to leave where they were staying at the time of data collection.

Protection of Women’s Needs

- 17% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities

- 4% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability.

Child Protection

- 3% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver.

Psychosocial Support

- 64% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

- 6. Dependency ratio is calculated by dividing the number of IDP individuals being hosted by the total size of the host household. The number shows the relative burden that hosting households have to support IDP households.
- 7. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
- 8. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
- 9. In many households in Central Sulawesi, there is a cultural practice in which a specific household owns many plots of land, and other households are permitted to live on it without any formal agreement.

Original home were living on their original land and considered to be non-displaced. Those living with friends or family, in an informal settlement, or renting after they were displaced from their homes were no longer living on their original land and had been displaced by the disaster. For households living in their original home, categorization of displacement was the same, except that those staying in tents next to their original home were considered to be displaced.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:

1. Request from owner of land (46%)
2. Request from authorities (34%)
3. Don’t know (20%)

19% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

85% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:

1. Assistance to build/repair shelter (70%)
2. Shelter building materials (58%)
3. Provide water to shelter (20%)

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set (77%)
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows) (64%)
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats (50%)

90% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

73% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

- 50% Water source located on site
- 30% Less than 10 minutes
- 10% 10–20 minutes
- 9% More than 20 minutes
- 1% Don’t know

87% of households have water available for hand washing.

57% of households have soap available for hand washing.

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- 45% Pouring device/sink faucet
- 39% Basin/bucket
- 16% No device
- 0% Don’t know

% of households by most common defecation practice:

- 36% Household latrine/toilet
- 36% Communal latrine/toilet
- 27% Open defecation
- 1% Don’t know

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

- 100% Flush toilet
- 0% Other

10. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
11. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
12. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water down the toilet to cause it to flush manually.
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There is an average of 9 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine. 13

Communal latrine conditions
76% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting
8% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women
76% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors

Waste disposal
% of households by reported main method of garbage disposal
4% Bin in household / street
1% Bury garbage
53% Burn garbage
26% Open area designated for waste
16% Open area not designated for waste
0% Other

% of households reporting how often garbage is collected from their area of residence:
46% Daily
17% Weekly
1% More than 1x per week
34% Service not available
1% Don’t know
1% Other

% of households reporting that the household main income was unemployment, before and after the disaster:

Before Disaster January 2019
5% are unemployed
17% of households had at least one working-age household member that is not working

Main reported barriers to finding work: 14
The recent disaster destroyed previous business/job opportunities 41%
Disaster destroyed cultivation land for planting 30%
Underqualified for available jobs 13%

There is an average reported loss of 20% of household income due to the disaster. 15

Food Security
Reported Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)

Food Consumption Score 16 average rCSI score 17
84% Acceptable
14% Borderline
2% Poor

13. Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.
14. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
15. Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.
16. FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).
17. rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
% of households per main reported source of food in week prior to data collection:18

- Purchased with own cash: 84%
- Food assistance (government): 4%
- Food assistance (charity, private company): 4%

Education

Student attendance

7% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster.

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school.

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school:19

1. Fear of school collapsing: 58%
2. Other: 20%
3. Child needed to work for income: 11%

Condition of school facilities

% of households reported the condition of the nearby school to be the following:

- Good condition: 13%
- Lightly damaged: 16%
- Moderately damaged: 41%
- Severe damage: 25%
- Don’t know: 5%
- Other: 0%

Health

Immunization

19% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

Illness and injury

50% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 types of health concerns reported by households with a member who had suffered from health issues in the 30 days prior to data collection:19

1. Coughing: 61%
2. Fever: 56%
3. Diarrheal diseases: 45%

Main barriers to accessing healthcare reported by households who had needed to access medical treatment the 30 days prior to data collection:19

- No issues: 74%
- Cost of medicine/treatment too high: 9%
- Don’t know: 4%

Main reasons (if any) that households have had to access health services in the 30 days prior to data collection:20

1. None: 40%
2. Treat health problems: 39%
3. Get regular medications: 38%

Priority Needs

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households:20

1. Food: 89%
2. Shelter support: 67%
3. Kitchen ware: 32%

Information Needs

% of households by the type of information that the household reported needing the most:18

- Status of housing: 43%
- Humanitarian assistance: 32%
- Livelihoods: 18%

18. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
19. Respondents could select multiple responses, therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
20. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
% of households by most preferred source from which they would like to receive new information:

- Face-to-face communication (e.g. from friends): 82%
- Television: 13%
- Social media: 2%

Humanitarian assistance

53% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received:
1. Food: 94%
2. Tents: 33%
3. Cash: 20%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:

- Government distribution: 32%
- NGO distribution: 24%
- Friends and family: 19%

61% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days:

- Quantity not enough: 75%
- Poor quality: 14%
- Delays in aid delivery: 6%

---

21. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
22. Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
23. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province.

A sample of 74 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 13% margin of error.

Demographics

Household composition by gender and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–59 years</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–17 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Head of Household

- 8% of heads of households were female
- 7% of heads of households were elderly
- Average age of the head of household in years: 41

Dependency ratio

- Average youth dependency ratio: 0.8
- Average elderly dependency ratio: 0.1
- Average age-dependency ratio: 0.9

% of households by current living location:

- Own home: 0%
- Shelter next to original home: 0%
- Renting (non-displaced): 100%
- Renting (displaced): 0%
- Staying in another home that is not their own: 0%
- Informal settlement: 0%
- Other: 0%

2. The boundaries and names used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by REACH, UNICEF, HFI, or UNISMUH. Population data was extracted at desa-level from SIAK (Population Information Administration System) database, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA, 2017). Population of missing desas was imputed using data from the Indonesia Bureau of Statistics, 2010.
3. Respondent metadata provides information on the respondents interviewed for the questionnaire. While the respondent was usually the head of household, if the head of household was not present at the time of interview, a member of the household knowledgeable about household affairs responded instead. This section only shows information on respondents, not the heads of household. Results in this section are not weighted by population, and should be considered as indicative.
4. Age-dependency ratio was calculated by dividing the number of under-age and elderly (non-productive) individuals (0–17 years for youth and 60+ years for elderly) by the number of adult (productive) individuals in the population (18–59 years). Anything below 1 shows that the population is mostly adults of working-age who can provide for those who are not.
5. Households were categorised based on whether they were still living on their original land, or if they were displaced by the disaster. Those living in their original home, renting (in the same location both before and after the disaster) or living in a tent/makeshift shelter next to their own home were classified as "own home".
**Displacement and Protection**

**Non-displaced population**

- 2% of non-displaced households were hosting at least one displaced household to stay in a house that they own.

There is an average of 3 IDP individuals in each displaced household hosted by a non-displaced household.

- 0.5 average dependency ratio of displaced household size to hosting household size for non-displaced households hosting IDPs.

**Movement intentions in the next 6 months**

- 83% of households by where they most want to move to within the next six months.
- 11% Don’t know
- 3% Move to a new location

**Top 3 most reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:**

1. Fear that land is still unsafe (44%)
2. Fear that house is still unsafe (34%)
3. Other (27%)

**Shelter**

**Shelter conditions**

- 0% House
- 100% Apartment
- 0% Transitional shelter (individual)
- 0% Makeshift Shelter
- 0% Tent
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

- 37% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

**% of households by state of tenure for house at the time of data collection:**

- 0% Household owns the land
- 32% Written agreement (still valid)
- 2% Written agreement (expired)
- 66% Verbal/no agreement
- 0% Don’t know

- 4% of households reported that they were at risk of being forced to leave shelter where they were staying at the time of data collection.

**Protection of Women’s Needs**

- 14% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

**Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities**

- 0% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability.

**Child Protection**

- 5% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver.

**Psychosocial Support**

- 39% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

---

6. Dependency ratio is calculated by dividing the number of IDP individuals being hosted by the total size of the host household. The number shows the relative burden that hosting households have to support IDP households.

7. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.

8. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

9. In many households in Central Sulawesi, there is a cultural practice in which a specific household owns many plots of land, and other households are permitted to live on it without any formal agreement.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:¹⁰

1. No money to pay rent (70%)
2. Request from authorities (70%)
3. Request from owner of land (30%)

0% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

22% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:¹¹

1. None (35%)
2. Assistance to build/repair shelter (34%)
3. Help to find rental arrangements; (23%)

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):¹¹

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; (55%)
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); (51%)
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats (28%)

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Access to Water

% of households acquired most of their drinking water from the following sources:

- Piped water (14%)
- Public tap (10%)
- Protected well/spring (7%)
- Water tank/trucking (2%)
- Bottled water (67%)
- Unprotected source (0%)
- Don’t know (0%)

93% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

92% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

- Water source located on site (95%)
- Less than 10 minutes (2%)
- 10–20 minutes (3%)
- More than 20 minutes (0%)
- Don’t know (0%)

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet (78%)
- Basin/bucket (20%)
- No device (2%)
- Don’t know (0%)

93% of households have water available for hand washing.

64% of households have soap available for hand washing.

Sanitation conditions

% of households by most common defecation practice:

- Household latrine/toilet (82%)
- Communal latrine/toilet (16%)
- Open defecation (2%)
- Don’t know (0%)

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

- Flush toilet (100%)
- Other (0%)

10. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

11. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

12. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water down the toilet to cause it to flush manually.
There is an average of 6 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine. Of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting. Of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women. Of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors.

**Communal latrine conditions**
- 83% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting.
- 8% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women.
- 74% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors.

**Waste disposal**
- 35% of households reported the main method of garbage disposal is bin in household / street.
- 0% of households bury garbage.
- 23% of households burn garbage.
- 31% of households report open area designated for waste.
- 9% of households report open area not designated for waste.
- 2% of households report other methods.

**Food Security**
- Reported Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)
- Food Consumption Score average: 98%
  - Acceptable: 98%
  - Borderline: 2%
  - Poor: 0%
- rCSI score: 3.9

**Economy**
- Occupation and employment
  - Main occupation of the household reported by households before the disaster and in the last month:
  - **Before Disaster**
    - 33% Small business owner
    - 11% Service industry
    - 10% Vocational profession
  - **January 2019**
    - 34% Small business owner
    - 10% Vocational profession
    - 9% Service industry

13. Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.
14. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
15. Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.
16. FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).
17. rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household adopted different coping strategies to make food last longer. The number of days was then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
### Education

**Student attendance**

6% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster.

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school.

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school:

1. Fear of school collapsing (100%)
2. School damaged/destroyed (58%)
3. Child not attending school before disaster (0%)

### Condition of school facilities

% of households reported the condition of the nearby school to be the following:

- 21% Good condition
- 21% Lightly damaged
- 19% Moderately damaged
- 12% Severe damage
- 22% Don’t know
- 5% Other

### Health

#### Immunization

26% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

#### Illness and injury

31% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

### Communication with Communities

#### Information Needs

% of households by the type of information that the household reported needing the most:

- Humanitarian assistance (34%)
- Status of housing (25%)
- Livelihoods (17%)

18. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.  
19. Respondents could select multiple responses, therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.  
20. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
% of households by most preferred source from which they would like to receive new information:21

- Face-to-face communication (e.g. from friends): 69%
- Television: 15%
- Social media: 12%

Humanitarian assistance

16% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received:22

1. Food: 100%
2. Water: 32%
3. Other NFIs: 9%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:23

- Government distribution: 42%
- Friends and family: 24%
- University: 23%

69% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days:23

- Quantity not enough: 100%
- Delays in aid delivery: 0%
- Poor quality: 0%

---

21. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
22. Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
23. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province.

A sample of 53 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 13% margin of error.

Respondent metadata

- Total households interviewed: 53
- Average age of respondent in years: 41
- % of households by current living location:
  - Own home: 0%
  - Shelter next to original home: 0%
  - Renting (non-displaced): 0%
  - Renting (displaced): 100%
  - Staying in another home that is not their own: 0%
  - Informal settlement: 0%
  - Other: 0%

Demographics

- Household composition by gender and age:
  - 2% females 60+ years
  - 29% males 18–59 years
  - 8% females 13–17 years
  - 8% males 6–12 years
  - 1% females <1 year

- Male demographic:
  - 3% males 1–5 years

- Female demographic:
  - 5% females 5–9 years

Dependency ratio:

- Average youth dependency ratio: 0.8
- Average elderly dependency ratio: 0.8
- Average age-dependency ratio: 0.8

There was an average of 5 individuals reported per household.

Household head:

- 15% of heads of households were female
- 6% of heads of households were elderly
- Average age of the head of household in years: 41

Dependency ratio:

- Average youth dependency ratio: 0.8
- Average elderly dependency ratio: 0.8
- Average age-dependency ratio: 0.8
### Displacement and Protection

**Displaced population**

100% of households were no longer living in their original house due to the disaster.

% of households no longer living on land they own by distance from their current living location to their original house:

- 22% Nearby/on site
- 22% Within 2km
- 12% Between 2km–5km
- 44% More than 5km or Don’t know

**Movement intentions in the next 6 months**

% of households by where they most want to move to within the next six months:

- Remain in the current location 52%
- Move to a new location 20%
- Return back to original home 14%

Top 3 most reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:

1. House destroyed/severely damaged 30%
2. Fear that land is still unsafe 29%
3. Area may be declared a no build (red) zone 28%

### Psychosocial Support

61% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

### Shelter

**Shelter conditions**

% of households by type of shelter they are currently living in at the time of data collection:

- 0% House
- 100% Apartment
- 0% Transitional shelter (individual)
- 0% Makeshift Shelter
- 0% Tent
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

78% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

% of households by state of tenure for house at the time of data collection:

- 0% Household owns the land
- 38% Written agreement (still valid)
- 2% Written agreement (expired)
- 60% Verbal/no agreement
- 0% Don’t know

### Protection of Women’s Needs

18% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

### Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities

2% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability.

### Child Protection

2% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:

1. NA (0%)
2. NA (0%)
3. NA (0%)

32% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

42% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:

1. Assistance to build/repair shelter (44%)
2. Shelter building materials (41%)
3. Tools for construction (18%)

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; 72%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); 62%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats 36%

Access to Water

% of households acquired most of their drinking water from the following sources:

- Piped water: 15%
- Public tap: 12%
- Protected well/spring: 3%
- Water tank/trucking: 2%
- Bottled water: 66%
- Unprotected source: 2%
- Don’t know: 0%

100% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

90% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

- Water source located on site: 91%
- Less than 10 minutes: 0%
- 10–20 minutes: 9%
- More than 20 minutes: 0%
- Don’t know: 0%

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet: 52%
- Basin/bucket: 39%
- No device: 9%
- Don’t know: 0%

97% of households have water available for hand washing.

82% of households have soap available for hand washing.

Sanitation conditions

% of households by most common defecation practice:

- Household latrine/toilet: 79%
- Communal latrine/toilet: 18%
- Open defecation: 3%
- Don’t know: 0%

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

- Flush toilet: 100%
- Other: 0%

9. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
10. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
11. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water town the toilet to cause it to flush manually.
There is an average of 3 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine.

### Communal latrine conditions
- 91% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting.
- 0% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women.
- 82% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors.

### Waste disposal
- 21% of households by reported main method of garbage disposal: Bin in household / street.
- 0% of households bury garbage.
- 38% of households burn garbage.
- 32% of households have an open area designated for waste.
- 9% of households have an open area not designated for waste.
- 0% of households have other methods of garbage disposal.

### Economy

#### Occupation and employment
- Main occupation of the household reported by households before the disaster and in the last month:
  - Before Disaster: January 2019
  - Small business owner: 37% before disaster, 32% in January.
  - Government job: 10% before disaster, 15% in January.
  - Service industry: 9% before disaster, 9% in January.

### Food Security

#### Reported Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)
- Food Consumption Score: 96% Acceptable.
- rCSI score: 1.4 Borderline.

12. Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.
13. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
14. Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.
15. FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).
16. rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household adopted different coping strategies to make food last longer. The number of days was then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
% of households per main reported source of food in week prior to data collection: 17

- Purchased with own cash: 97%
- Gift from family or friends: 2%
- Purchased on credit (debt): 1%

**Education**

**Student attendance**

4% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster.

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school.

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school: 18

1. Household displaced; school too far: 74%
2. School fees too expensive: 74%
3. Child needed to work for income: 26%

**Condition of school facilities**

% of households reported the condition of the nearby school to be the following:

- Good condition: 12%
- Lightly damaged: 20%
- Moderately damaged: 37%
- Severe damage: 9%
- Don’t know: 13%
- Other: 9%

**Health**

**Immunization**

26% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

**Illness and injury**

26% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

**Top 3 types of health concerns reported by households with a member who had suffered from health issues in the 30 days prior to data collection:** 18

1. Fever: 54%
2. Coughing: 47%
3. Diarrheal diseases: 23%

**Main barriers to accessing healthcare reported by households who had needed to access medical treatment the 30 days prior to data collection:** 18

- No issues: 83%
- No medicine/treatment available: 8%
- No information where health facilities are: 8%

**Main reasons (if any) that households have had to access health services in the 30 days prior to data collection:** 19

1. None: 53%
2. Get regular medications: 34%
3. Treat health problems: 27%

**Priority Needs**

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households: 19

1. Food: 68%
2. Shelter support: 58%
3. Kitchen ware: 45%

**Communication with Communities**

**Information Needs**

% of households by the type of information that the household reported needing the most: 17

- Status of housing: 52%
- Humanitarian assistance: 17%
- Livelihoods: 13%

17. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
18. Respondents could select multiple responses, therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
19. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
% of households by most preferred source from which they would like to receive new information:20

- Face-to-face communication (e.g. from friends): 56%
- Television: 24%
- Social media: 13%

Humanitarian assistance

18% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received:21

1. Food: 74%
2. Other NFIs: 27%
3. Shelter: 22%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:22

- Government distribution: 44%
- NGO distribution: 22%
- Private Company: 20%

95% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days:22

- Quantity not enough: 100%
- Other: 0%
- Don’t know: 0%

---

20. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
21. Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
22. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province.

A sample of 375 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error.

Demographics

Household composition by gender and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>60+ years</th>
<th>18–59 years</th>
<th>13–17 years</th>
<th>6–12 years</th>
<th>1–5 years</th>
<th>&lt;1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an average of 5 individuals reported per household.

Head of Household

- 14% of heads of households were female
- 8% of heads of households were elderly
- Average age of the head of household in years: 43

Dependency ratio

- Average youth dependency ratio: 0.7
- Average elderly dependency ratio: 0.2
- Average age-dependency ratio: 0.9

% of households by current living location:

- Own home: 0%
- Shelter next to original home: 0%
- Renting (non-displaced): 0%
- Renting (displaced): 0%
- Staying in another home that is not their own: 100%
- Informal settlement: 0%
- Other: 0%

2. The boundaries and names used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by REACH, UNICEF, HFI, or UNISMUH. Population data was extracted at desa-level from SIAK (Population Information Administration System) database, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA, 2017). Population of missing desas was imputed using data from the Indonesia Bureau of Statistics, 2010.
3. Respondent metadata provides information on the respondents interviewed for the questionnaire. While the respondent was usually the head of household, if the head of household was not present at the time of interview, a member of the household knowledgeable about household affairs responded instead. This section only shows information on respondents, not the heads of household. Results in this section are not weighted by population, and should be considered as indicative.
4. Age-dependency ratio was calculated by dividing the number of under-age and elderly (non-productive) individuals (0–17 years for youth and 60+ years for elderly) by the number of adult (productive) individuals in the population (18–59 years). Anything below 1 shows that the population is mostly adults of working-age who can provide for those who are not.
5. Households were categorised based on whether they were still living on their original land, or if they were displaced by the disaster. Those living in their original home, renting (in the same location both before and after the disaster) or living in a tent/makeshift shelter next to their original home are classified as 'own home'.
**Displaced and Protection**

100% of households were no longer living in their original house due to the disaster.

- **Psychosocial Support**
  - 57% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

**Shelter**

- **Shelter conditions**
  - 88% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

**Displaced population**

- 100% of households were no longer living in their original house due to the disaster.

- Percentage of households no longer living on land they own by distance from their current living location to their original house:
  - 68% Nearby/on site
  - 11% Within 2km
  - 5% Between 2km–5km
  - 16% More than 5km or Don’t know

**Movement intentions in the next 6 months**

- Percentage of households by where they most want to move to within the next six months:
  - Remain in the current location: 76%
  - Return back to original home: 13%
  - Move into the Government Transitional Shelter: 6%

**Top 3 most reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:**

1. House destroyed/severely damaged: 53%
2. Heavy damage to house: 27%
3. Mild damage to house: 21%

**Protection of Women’s Needs**

- 22% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

**Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities**

- 3% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability.

**Child Protection**

- 4% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver.

---

6. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
7. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
8. In many households in Central Sulawesi, there is a cultural practice in which a specific household owns many plots of land, and other households are permitted to live on it without any formal agreement.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:

1. Request from authorities: 76%
2. Request from owner of land: 35%
3. No money to pay rent: 0%

10% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

79% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:

1. Assistance to build/repair shelter: 64%
2. Shelter building materials: 42%
3. None: 15%

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set: 58%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows): 52%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats: 39%

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Access to Water

% of households acquired most of their drinking water from the following sources:

- Piped water: 27%
- Public tap: 25%
- Protected well/spring: 13%
- Water tank/trucking: 3%
- Bottled water: 21%
- Unprotected source: 5%
- Don’t know: 6%

95% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

87% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

- Water source located on site: 80%
- Less than 10 minutes: 13%
- 10–20 minutes: 4%
- More than 20 minutes: 3%
- Don’t know: 0%

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet: 62%
- Basin/bucket: 30%
- No device: 8%
- Don’t know: 0%

88% of households have water available for hand washing.

62% of households have soap available for hand washing.

Sanitation conditions

% of households by most common defecation practice:

- Household latrine/toilet: 75%
- Communal latrine/toilet: 14%
- Open defecation: 9%
- Don’t know: 2%

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

- 100% Flush toilet
- 0% Other

9. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
10. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
11. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water to cause it to flush manually.
There is an average of 7 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine.\(^{12}\)

**Communal latrine conditions**

- 79% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting
- 5% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women
- 73% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors

**Waste disposal**

% of households by reported main method of garbage disposal:

- 14% Bin in household / street
- 0% Bury garbage
- 49% Burn garbage
- 20% Open area designated for waste
- 15% Open area not designated for waste
- 2% Other

% of households reporting how often garbage is collected from their area of residence:

- 38% Daily
- 26% Weekly
- 0% More than 1x per week
- 31% Service not available
- 3% Don’t know
- 2% Other

**Economy**

**Occupation and employment**

Main occupation of the household reported by households before the disaster and in the last month:\(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26% Agricultural</td>
<td>25% Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Small business owner</td>
<td>16% Small business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Service industry</td>
<td>11% Unemployed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting that the household main income was unemployment, before and after the disaster:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4% are unemployed</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main reported barriers to finding work:\(^{13}\)

- The recent disaster destroyed previous business/job opportunities: 54%
- Available jobs are too far away: 17%
- Disaster destroyed cultivation land for planting: 14%

There is an average reported loss of 10% of household income due to the disaster.\(^{15}\)

**Food Security**

Reported Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Score(^{15})</th>
<th>average rCSI score(^{16})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% Acceptable</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Borderline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12. Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.
13. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
14. Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.
15. FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).
16. rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household adopted different coping strategies to make food last longer. The number of days was then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
% of households per main reported source of food in week prior to data collection: 17

- Purchased with own cash: 93%
- Gift from family or friends: 3%
- Food assistance (government): 1%

### Education

**Student attendance**

- 5% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school: 18

1. School damaged/destroyed: 39%
2. Fear of school collapsing: 18%
3. Household displaced; school too far: 16%

### Condition of school facilities

- 18% Good condition
- 25% Lightly damaged
- 35% Moderately damaged
- 10% Severe damage
- 9% Don’t know
- 3% Other

### Health

#### Immunization

- 22% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

#### Illness and injury

- 51% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection

### Communication with Communities

#### Information Needs

- 17. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.

### Priority Needs

- 19. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households: 19

1. Food: 84%
2. Shelter support: 36%
3. Kitchen ware: 33%
% of households by most preferred source from which they would like to receive new information:20

- Face-to-face communication (e.g. from friends) 66%
- Television 20%
- Social media 6%

Humanitarian assistance

33% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received:21

1. Food 91%
2. Water 17%
3. Other NFI 14%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:22

- Government distribution 56%
- NGO distribution 14%
- Friends and family 10%

58% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days:22

- Quantity not enough 97%
- Aid received is not useful 3%
- Don’t know 0%

20. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
21. Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
22. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
Background and methodology

Following a 7.7 magnitude earthquake on 28 September, 2018, large parts of Palu, Donggala, Sigi, and Parigi Moutong regencies in Central Sulawesi province were destroyed by earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction events. As of 10 December 2018, approximately 2,101 people have been killed, 1,373 are missing, and an estimated 133,631 individuals were displaced in informal settlements. An estimated 15,000 houses have been destroyed and another 17,000 heavily damaged. However, four months after the initial disaster, there is still very little understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the affected population in Central Sulawesi Province.

To fill this gap, a Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) was conducted by Humanitarian Forum Indonesia (HFI) and Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu (UNISMUH) with oversight from the Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos) and technical support from REACH, in 38 of 62 sub-districts in the four affected regencies of Central Sulawesi Province.

A sample of 331 out of a total population of 253,926 households were surveyed across the four affected regencies between 22 January and 6 February 2019. Results were weighted by population and generalizable to the crisis level with 95% confidence level and 6% margin of error.

Respondent metadata

- Total households interviewed: 331
- Average age of respondent in years: 42
- Of respondents were female: 58%

Demographics

Household composition by gender and age

- Male
  - 3% 60+ years
  - 27% 18–59 years
  - 8% 13–17 years
  - 7% 6–12 years
  - 5% 1–5 years
  - 1% <1 year

- Female
  - 97%

There was an average of 5 individuals reported per household.

Head of Household

- 10% heads of households were female
- 12% heads of households were elderly
- Average age of the head of household in years: 44

Dependency ratio

- Average youth dependency ratio: 0.9
- Average elderly dependency ratio: 0.2
- Average age-dependency ratio: 1

% of households by current living location:

- 0% Own home
- 0% Shelter next to original home
- 0% Renting (non-displaced)
- 0% Renting (displaced)
- 0% Staying in another home that is not their own
- 100% Informal settlement
- 0% Other

2. The boundaries and names used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by REACH, UNICEF, HFI, or UNISMUH. Population data was extracted at desa-level from SIAK (Population Information Administration System) database, Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA, 2017). Population of missing desas was imputed using data from the Indonesia Bureau of Statistics, 2010.
3. Respondent metadata provides information on the respondents interviewed for the questionnaire. While the respondent was usually the head of household, if the head of household was not present at the time of interview, a member of the household knowledgeable about household affairs responded instead. This section only shows information on respondents, not the heads of household. Results in this section are not weighted by population, and should be considered as indicative.
4. Age-dependency ratio was calculated by dividing the number of under-age and elderly (non-productive) individuals (0–17 years for youth and 60+ years for elderly) by the number of adult (productive) individuals in the population (18–59 years). Anything below 1 shows that the population is mostly adults of working-age who can provide for those who are not.
5. Households were categorised based on whether they were still living on their original land, or if they were displaced by the disaster. Those living in their original home, renting (in the same location both before and after the disaster) or living in a tent/makeshift shelter next to their
**Displacement and Protection**

**Displaced population**

100% of households were no longer living in their original house due to the disaster.

- 28% Nearby/on site
- 44% Within 2km
- 18% Between 2km–5km
- 10% More than 5km or Don’t know

**Movement intentions in the next 6 months**

- 42% Remain in the current location
- 24% Move into the Government Transitional Shelter
- 18% Return back to original home

Top 3 reported reasons as to why households chose to move or to stay in their preferred living location for the next 6 months:

1. House destroyed/severely damaged 71%
2. Heavy damage to house 23%
3. Area may be declared a no build (red) zone 13%

**Psychosocial Support**

71% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

**Shelter**

**Shelter conditions**

- 95% of households reported that their original shelter was either destroyed or damaged by the disaster.

**Protection of Women’s Needs**

- 21% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman

**Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities**

- 3% of households contained at least one member with a self-reported physical or mental disability

**Child Protection**

- 5% of households contained at least one child that was separated from their usual caregiver

---

7. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
8. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
9. In many households in Central Sulawesi, there is a cultural practice in which a specific household owns many plots of land, and other households are permitted to live on it without any formal agreement.
Top 3 reported reasons households were at risk of being forced to leave their shelters at the time of data collection:9

1. Authorities requested our household to leave. 76%
2. Request to vacate from owner of building/land. 56%
3. Local community does not accept them 31%

29% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

61% of households reported that they would prefer to rebuild or repair their original home in the next 6 months.

Top 3 preferred types of assistance that households wanted to receive in order to rebuild/repair their homes in the 6 months after data collection:10

1. Assistance to build/repair shelter 58%
2. Building materials (concrete, wood) 38%
3. Space in Transitional Shelter 22%

Top 3 most needed Non-Food Items (NFIs):10

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; 70%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); 57%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats 51%

Access to Water

% of households acquired most of their drinking water from the following sources:

16% Piped water
30% Public tap
12% Protected well/spring
14% Water tank/trucking
19% Bottled water
8% Unprotected source
1% Don’t know

92% of households reported drinking water that had been treated and was safe to drink.

72% of households reported having enough water to meet their total needs for drinking, cooking, bathing, and washing.

% of households by reported amount of time it takes to walk to main water source, fetch water, and return (including queuing at the water source):

49% Water source located on site
33% Less than 10 minutes
11% 10–20 minutes
7% More than 20 minutes
0% Don’t know

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

44% Pouring device/sink faucet
38% Basin/bucket
18% No device
0% Don’t know

90% of households have water available for hand washing.

59% of households have soap available for hand washing.

Sanitation conditions

% of households by most common defecation practice:

13% Household latrine/toilet
75% Communal latrine/toilet
10% Open defecation
2% Don’t know

% of households using a household or communal latrine/toilet, by type of latrine/toilet:

99% Flush toilet11
1% Other

10. Respondents could select multiple responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
11. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
12. “Flush toilets” includes both toilets where a lever automatically makes the toilet flush and the practice of dumping water town the toilet to cause it to flush manually.
There is an average of 26 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine.

Communal latrine conditions
- 70% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting.
- 15% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women.
- 81% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors.

Waste disposal
- 14% of households by reported main method of garbage disposal:
  - Bin in household / street
  - Burn garbage
  - Open area designated for waste
  - Open area not designated for waste
  - Other

- 0% Bury garbage
- 46% Burn garbage
- 24% Open area designated for waste
- 13% Open area not designated for waste
- 3% Other

% of households reporting how often garbage is collected from their area of residence:
- 38% Daily
- 22% Weekly
- 4% More than 1x per week
- 35% Service not available
- 1% Don’t know
- 0% Other

Population: Informal Settlements

% of households reporting that the household main income was unemployment, before and after the disaster:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4% are unemployed</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main reported barriers to finding work:
- The recent disaster destroyed previous business/job opportunities: 53%
- The recent disaster destroyed cultivation land for planting: 14%
- The recent disaster destroyed boats/fishing materials: 8%

There is an average reported loss of 20% of household income due to the disaster.

Food Security

Food Consumption Score (FCS) and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>rCSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economy

Occupation and employment

Main occupation of the household reported by households before the disaster and in the last month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29% Agricultural</td>
<td>1 Unemployed 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% Small business owner</td>
<td>2 Agricultural 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% Service industry</td>
<td>3 Small business owner 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Average taken from households reporting the use of communal latrines.
13. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
14. Due to the sensitivity over asking about monthly income, respondents were asked what range their monthly income fell within. The upper bound of the range was used, and current income was divided by previous income before being averaged.
15. FCS is a measure of food security that looks at how often foods are consumed over a 1 week period, in order to give an indication if the household is eating a sufficient amount of food. FCS was calculated using the WFP CARI methodology, by asking respondents how many days per week their household consumed different groups of food, which are then multiplied by a coefficient based on the food group, added up, and ascribed a ranking (acceptable, borderline, or poor) based on the number (WFP, Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), 2014).
16. rCSI is a measure of food security that looks at a set list of five coping strategies that households might be using to make food last longer in the absence of sufficient foods. It uses 5 commonly practiced coping strategies across the world. rCSI was calculated by asking respondents how many days per week their household adopted different coping strategies to make food last longer. The number of days was then multiplied by a coefficient based on the coping strategy and added up. There are no officially established thresholds, but generally, scores between 0 and 3 are considered to be good, 4 to 9 is worrisome, and scores greater than or equal to 10 are concerning (WFP VAM Unit, Afghanistan, Guidance note: calculation of household food security outcome indicators, December 2012).
% of households per main reported source of food in week prior to data collection: 17

- Purchased with own cash: 64%
- Food assistance from government: 16%
- Food assistance (charity, private company): 14%

**Education**

**Student attendance**

- 8% of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster.

Among households where children were not attending school, there was an average of 1 child(ren) reported to not be attending school.

Top 3 reported reasons why school-aged children were not attending school by households with children not attending school: 18

1. School was damaged or destroyed by the September earthquake/tsunami: 27%
2. Other: 20%
3. School fees are too expensive: 20%

**Condition of school facilities**

- 8% of households reported the condition of the nearby school to be Good condition
- 14% Lightly damaged
- 29% Moderately damaged
- 40% Severe damage
- 6% Don’t know
- 3% Other

**Health**

**Immunization**

- 22% of households reported having children in the household that were not immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR).

**Illness and injury**

- 51% of households reported that a member of the household had suffered from a health issue (illness or injury) in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 types of health concerns reported by households with a member who had suffered from health issues in the 30 days prior to data collection: 18

1. Fever: 59%
2. Coughing: 53%
3. Diarrheal diseases: 33%

Main barriers to accessing healthcare reported by households who had needed to access medical treatment the 30 days prior to data collection: 18

1. No issues: 78%
2. Cost of medicine/treatment too high: 7%
3. No information where health facilities are: 4%

Main reasons (if any) that households have had to access health services in the 30 days prior to data collection: 19

1. Get regular medications: 42%
2. None: 39%
3. Treat health problems: 36%

**1.2.3 Priority Needs**

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households: 19

1. Food: 89%
2. Shelter support: 56%
3. Kitchen ware: 37%

**Communication with Communities**

**Information Needs**

% of households by the type of information that the household reported needing the most: 17

- Status of housing: 48%
- Humanitarian assistance: 26%
- Livelihoods: 17%

17. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.

18. Respondents could select multiple responses, therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.

19. Respondents could select up to three responses; therefore results may exceed 100%; only the top three choices are shown.
### % of Households by Most Preferred Source from Which They Would Like to Receive New Information: 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face communication (e.g., from friends)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/mobile phone (Voice Call)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Humanitarian Assistance

66% of households reported that they had received humanitarian aid in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Top 3 most common types of aid that households reported having received: 21

1. **Food** 92%
2. **Water** 25%
3. **Tents** 19%

### % of Households by Most Common Reported Source of Aid: 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government distribution</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO distribution</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organization</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67% of households reported that they were happy with the aid that they had received in the 30 days prior to data collection.

Main reported reasons households were not satisfied by the aid received in the last 30 days: 22

- Quantity not enough: 76%
- Other: 11%
- Delays in aid delivery: 5%

---

20. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.
21. Respondents could select multiple responses; only the top three choices are shown.
22. Single-choice question; only the top three responses are shown.