Context and Methodology

After 40 years of continued crisis, Afghanistan remains one of the world’s most complex humanitarian emergencies, driven by escalating conflict and devastating natural disasters. Depleted resilience to cope with the repeated shocks of displacement have made it difficult for households to withstand the harsh winter condition, where monthly temperatures can reach as low as -12.1 degrees celsius.

In response to the persistent need for winterization assistance, the Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Item (ES/NFI) Cluster, in coordination with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GoIRA) through the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation (MoRR), released a Joint Winterization Strategy in July 2019 aimed to assist 95,350 vulnerable families with support for the winter season period from November 2019 to February 2020. The strategy prioritized a set of solutions, including adequate shelter, heating, NFIs, winter clothing, food assistance, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and medicine and health supplies, ultimately reaching 71,405 households during the 2019/2020 winter period. However, the overall impact of the response was unclear.

In order to address the impact of the Winterization Response, REACH conducted a household assessment across all 8 regions of Afghanistan, of which a total of 4,584 were sampled from host communities, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), and non-beneficiary households at a regional level, with 95% confidence and a 7% margin of error relative to the population. Data was stratified by impact of aid for beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, the modality of the aid received, and the region where aid was received. Data was collected from 27 May - 28 June 2020.

This factsheet displays the data from host community, IDPs, and non-beneficiary households for the South East Region, where 554 surveys were conducted.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Proportion of households surveyed, by reported displacement status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDP Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Host Community Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Non-beneficiaries³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessed households, by age and gender of each household member:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="2% 0% 2%" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="60+ 6% 6%" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="17% 18-59 17%" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="19% 18-59 19%" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="19% 5-17 19%" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="19% 5-17 19%" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="9% 1-4 8%" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="9% 1-4 8%" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="3% &lt;1 2%" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="3% &lt;1 2%" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Female-headed households: 6%

#### Average household size: 9 members

1. A total of 3,509 HH interviews were conducted with IDP and Host populations. An additional 1,390 HH interviews were conducted with other population groups, such as Cross-Border Returnees (89), Refugees (South-East) (59), IDP Returnees (160), and Non-Beneficiaries (1,085).
2. Non-beneficiaries: the control group was mixed, being either households who were assessed by the ES/NFI Cluster for winterization assistance, but were either ineligible for assistance or eligible but did not receive any; additionally, as the number of non-beneficiaries received from implementing partners was low, non-beneficiary data was also gathered from DoRR. They were based in communities where either other households did receive aid, or in communities where aid was not distributed under the Winterization Response.
3. A person was considered to have a disability or chronic illness if they have a physical or mental condition which prevents them from taking care of themselves or participating in society on an equal basis as others. See UNHCR Emergency Handbook.
4. A household was classified as vulnerable, if they were in one of the following vulnerable categories: female headed households, elderly person headed households (with members >/<18 years old), disabled headed household (with members >/<18 years old), child (under 18) headed household, families with chronically ill members or very large families (8 members or more). ES/NFI Cluster Vulnerability Score Card Afghanistan.
5. A tazkera is the primary Afghan personal identification document and is “necessary to receive a variety of government services, employment in the government/private sector, and are necessary to obtain other identity documents such as passports and driver’s licenses”. Online information available here.
Livelihoods

98% of households reported having at least one breadwinner. Of these households, the average reported household earnings for the 30 days prior to data collection was 5,802 AFG.

% of households reporting having only one breadwinner who is working in unskilled daily labour:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of households reporting sources of money in the 30 days prior to data collection, the top three most commonly reported main sources were:

- Income through work/labour: 93%
- Borrow money / take on debt: 12%
- Government benefits (pension): 3%

Of households reporting that work was a source of earnings in the last 30 days, the top three most commonly reported types of work providing that income were:

- Unskilled daily labour: 60%
- Skilled daily labour: 32%
- Formal employment / with contract: 3%

Displaced Population

90% of IDP households reported that their current location was not the area of origin for the majority of the household members.

Most commonly reported main reasons for displaced households choosing to leave area of origin:

- Clashes among Armed Opposition Groups: 53%
- Armed conflict / military operation: 27%
- Natural disaster: 8%

% of displaced households by length of time living in current location, in months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt;1 - 3 months</th>
<th>4 - 12 months</th>
<th>&gt; 1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting living in different shelter types:

- Permanent: 77%
- Transitional: 14%
- Makeshift: 6%
- Tent: 2%
- Unfinished house: 1%
- Damaged house: 0%

Priority Needs

Households' most commonly reported first priority need during the November 2019 - March 2020 winter period:

1. Heating materials / fuel: 59%
2. Food: 34%
3. Shelter repair: 3%

Top 3 reported most critically needed shelter repairs / upgrades during the last winter period:

- Openings: 53%
- Thermal floor mats: 32%
- Plastic tarpaulin: 31%

Top 3 reported most critically needed NFIs during the last winter period:

- Firewood / charcoal / gas for heating: 91%
- Gas cylinder / bukhari: 56%
- Winter clothing: 55%

Debt Coping Strategies

Average amount of new debt reportedly acquired over the last winter, in AFN:

- Beneficiary households: 22,545 AFN
- Non-beneficiary households: 26,765 AFN

Ability of households to repay debt acquired over the last winter within the next year, in % of households:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Won't say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-beneficiaries</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of households reporting not being able to repay debts, the most commonly reported coping strategies were:

- Adults work extra shifts/jobs or begging: 44%
- Reduction of food expenses: 35%
- Reduction of non-food expenses: 18%
Livelihoods Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take low paying jobs</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take on debt</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce money spent on food</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce money spent on services</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take children out of school to work</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell assets</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send household members to beg</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell shelter/land</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shelter Coping Strategies

Of households reporting not or only partially being able to get the items needed for shelter repairs, the most commonly reported coping strategies were: 10

- Borrow money / take on debt: 48%
- Reduction of food expenses: 44%
- Reduction of non-food expenses: 32%

83% of households reported that if they were unable to find shelter for their household, they resorted to living in tents. 9% of households reported that they were living in an unsafe shelter.

NFI Coping Strategies

Households’ most commonly reported coping strategies when households could not or partially not meet NFI gaps: 10

- Borrow money / take on debt: 62%
- Reduction of food expenses: 39%
- Reduction of non-food expenses: 31%

Heating Coping Strategies

% of households reporting having been unable to heat their shelter sufficiently in the 5 months prior to data collection:

- Non-beneficiary households: 82%
- Beneficiary households: 42%

Of all households reporting having been unable to heat their shelter (62%), the most commonly reported coping strategies were:

- Borrow money to buy fuel: 34%
- Burn plastic or other harmful materials: 28%
- Sleep in overcrowded room: 22%

% of households by reported inability to meet their shelter winterization needs, by beneficiary status:

- Beneficiaries: 39%
- Non-beneficiaries: 58%

% of households by reported inability to meet their NFI winterization needs, by beneficiary status:

- Beneficiaries: 4%
- Non-beneficiaries: 28%

10. Respondents could select multiple options.
Most commonly reported types of assistance received that were reported to mostly, almost or completely meet the households’ critical shelter repairs needs:

- Soil for adobe /rammed / cob type house: 19%
- New or replacement tents: 14%
- Plastic tarpaulin: 12%

Most commonly reported NFI items assistance received that were reported to mostly, almost or completely meet the households’ NFI winterization needs:

- Buckets or other water containers: 67%
- Other kitchen materials (utensils etc.): 55%
- Firewood / charcoal / gas for heating: 54%

% of beneficiary households by reported satisfaction with overall experience of receiving assistance, from being assessed to receiving assistance, by aid modality:

- **Cash**
  - Unrestricted cash: 99% Very satisfied
  - Restricted cash: 0% Satisfied
  - Voucher: 1% Less satisfied
  - In kind: 0% Not satisfied

- **Restricted cash**: 78% Very satisfied
  - 21% Satisfied
  - 1% Less satisfied
  - 0% Not satisfied

- **Unrestricted cash**: 69% Very satisfied
  - 28% Satisfied
  - 3% Less satisfied
  - 0% Not satisfied

83% of beneficiary households reported having spent the restricted cash on something other than what the assistance provider required them to spend on. Of these households, 71% reported having spent the restricted cash on food.

Reported impact of the assistance on the wellbeing of the household over the last winter period, by % of beneficiary households:

- 1% Created problems
- 0% No impact
- 46% Improved a little
- 53% Improved a lot

38% of beneficiary households reported that the positive impact of the winterization response has not continued after March 2020.

No representative sample of households reported receiving in kind or voucher assistance in South East region.
ACCOUNTABILITY

Most commonly reported forms of additional help that would help vulnerable households accessing assistance in the future, as reported by households with vulnerable individuals:

- Assistance delivered to shelter: 78%
- Separate spaces for women and men: 13%
- A staff member to accompany beneficiary through the procedure: 8%

6% of beneficiary households reported that the assistance received did not come early enough to be effective in preparing for the winter.

23% of beneficiary households reported that the assistance was provided later than the organisation’s advised timeframe.

4% of beneficiary households reported having faced challenges during the distribution of assistance. The most commonly reported challenge was: had to wait 2 hours or more to get the cash (84%).

4% of beneficiary households reported that someone from the household made a complaint to the organization providing assistance about the winterization assistance or its delivery.

Most commonly reported actions households would reportedly take if they had questions or a problem with the cash distribution or in-kind assistance, by % of beneficiary households:

- Nothing: 37%
- Tell organization staff face-to-face: 33%
- Call the organization by phone: 16%
- Tell community leader: 11%

Reported time it took travelling to collect the assistance (one way), by reported modality received, by % of households:

**Restricted cash:**

- 5% >1 hour
- 27% 30 min - 1 hour
- 68% <30 min

**Unrestricted cash:**

- 3% >1 hour
- 23% 30 min - 1 hour
- 73% <30 min

Community Relations

Reported impact of winterization assistance on community relations, by % of households:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Created tensions with community</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Reduced tensions with community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-beneficiaries</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market access

38% of households reported facing challenges accessing markets to buy NFIs, food or shelter materials over the last winter.

Of households reporting challenges, most commonly reported challenges when accessing markets:

- Amount of cash was not adequate: 84%
- Increased prices: 82%
- Poor quality items: 36%

% of households reporting changes in prices or availability of the following items since the last winter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber for repairs</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass for windows</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/kitchen items</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal / Wood</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Cylinder / stove</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets and quilts</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukhari stove</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm jacket</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas liquid</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported time it takes travelling to reach the market (one way), by % of households:

- 4% >1 hour
- 22% 30 min - 1 hour
- 74% <30 min

---

12. Respondents could select multiple options.
About REACH
REACH Initiative facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capability of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT).