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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 3835 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 99% confidence level and 2.5% margin of error.

Demographics

- **Household composition by gender and age**
  - Male: 70%
  - Female: 30%
  - 60+ years: 3%
  - 18-59 years: 28%
  - 13-17 years: 6%
  - 6-12 years: 6%
  - <1 year: 1%

- **Head of Household**
  - 12% of heads of households were female
  - 45% of heads of households were elderly

- **Dependency ratio**
  - Youth dependency ratio: 0.7
  - Elderly dependency ratio: 0.2
  - Age-dependency ratio: 0.9

- **% of households by current living location**
  - Own home: 71%
  - Renting (non-displaced): 3%
  - Renting (displaced): 2%
  - Shelter next to original home: 10%
  - Informal settlement: 9%
  - Staying in another home that is not their own: 9%
  - 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 SIAP (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.
Displaced population

26% 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:

- 49% Nearby/on site
- 25% Within 2km
- 11% Between 2km–5km
- 15% More than 5km or Don’t know

Non-displaced population

6% 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, with an average dependency ratio of 0.6 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:

- 87% Remain in the current location
- 4% Move into the Government Transitional Shelter
- 3% Return back to original home

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 56%
2. Heavy damage to house 35%
3. Mild damage to house 20%

Protection of Women’s Needs

16% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman.

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.

Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities

2% 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

51% of households reported having at least one member experiencing emotional distress from the disaster.

Shelter

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

- 79% House
- 5% Apartment
- 3% Transitional shelter (individual)
- 4% Makeshift Shelter
- 9% Tent
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

66% 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:

- 34% Household owns the land
- 11% Written agreement (still valid)
- 3% Written agreement (expired)
- 51% Verbal/no agreement
- 1% 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.

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. Authorities requested our household to leave. 56%
2. Request to vacate from owner of building/land. 42%
3. Other 7%

6% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster

Preferred Shelter Assistance

67% 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. Building materials (concrete, wood) 45%
3. None 19%

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

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; 58%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); 49%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats 37%

Access to Water

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

- Piped water 28%
- Public tap 27%
- Protected well/spring 12%
- Water tank/trucking 4%
- Bottled water 22%
- Unprotected source 6%
- Don’t know 1%

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 5%
- More than 20 minutes 2%
- Don’t know 0%

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet 59%
- Basin/bucket 33%
- No device 8%
- 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 71%
- Communal latrine/toilet 18%
- Open defecation 9%
- Don’t know 2%

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

- Flush toilet12 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 14 households reported to be sharing each communal latrine\(^\text{13}\).

Communal latrine conditions

- 82% 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.
- 77% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors.

Waste disposal

- 14% of households reported how often garbage is collected from their area of residence:
  - 38% Daily
  - 25% Weekly
  - 2% More than 1x per week
  - 33% Service not available
  - 2% Don’t know
  - 0% Other

- % of households by reported main method of garbage disposal:
  - 14% Bin in household / street
  - 1% Bury garbage
  - 49% Burn garbage
  - 24% Open area designated for waste
  - 11% Open area not designated for waste
  - 1% Other

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Disaster January 2019</th>
<th>January 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% are unemployed</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of households had at least one working-age household member that is not working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main reported barriers to finding work:\(^\text{14}\)

- The recent disaster destroyed previous business/job opportunities (42%)
- The recent disaster destroyed cultivation land for planting (14%)
- Underqualified for available jobs (12%)

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

Food Security

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Score</th>
<th>average rCSI score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</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 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: 91%
- Food assistance from government: 2%
- Food assistance (charity, private company): 2%

Education

Student attendance of households with children reported having school-aged children who were not attending school following the disaster:

4%

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. School was damaged or destroyed by the September earthquake/tsunami: 32%
2. Fear of school collapsing: 22%
3. Other (specify): 12%

Condition of school facilities

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

- Good condition: 20%
- Lightly damaged: 26%
- Moderately damaged: 29%
- Severe damage: 14%
- Don’t know: 9%
- Other: 2%

Health

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

18%

Illness and injury 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:

39%

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:

1. Fever: 55%
2. Coughing: 52%
3. Diarrheal diseases: 26%

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

1. No issues: 79%
2. Cost of medicine/treatment too high: 8%
3. Don’t know: 3%

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

1. None: 41%
2. Get regular medications: 38%
3. Treat health problems: 35%

Priority Needs

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households:

1. Food: 78%
2. Kitchen ware: 37%
3. Shelter support: 29%

Communication with Communities

Information Needs

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

- Humanitarian assistance: 32%
- Livelihoods: 22%
- Status of housing: 21%

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) 68%
- Television 21%
- Social media 2%

**Humanitarian assistance**

29% 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 90%
2. Water 17%
3. Tents 17%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:

- Government distribution 47%
- NGO distribution 23%
- Friends and family 9%

70% 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 85%
- Aid received is not useful 5%
- Other 4%

---

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 429 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 99% confidence level and 5% margin of error.

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household composition by gender and age</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% 60+ years</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% 18–59 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% 13–17 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% 6–12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% 1–5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% &lt;1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Head of Household

- 30% of heads of households were female
- 51% average age of the head of household in years

Dependency ratio

- 0.8 average youth dependency ratio
- 0.3 average elderly dependency ratio
- 1.1 average age-dependency ratio

% of households by current living location:

- 72% Own home
- 2% Shelter next to original home
- 2% Renting (non-displaced)
- 3% Renting (displaced)
- 12% Staying in another home that is not their own
- 9% 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:
- 26% 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:
- 55% Nearby/on site
- 17% Within 2km
- 7% Between 2km–5km
- 21% More than 5km or Don’t know

Non-displaced population:
- 7% of non-displaced households were hosting at least one displaced household to stay in a house that they own

There is an average of 4 IDP individuals in each displaced household hosted by a non-displaced household

average dependency ratio of displaced household size to hosting household size for non-displaced households hosting IDPs:
- 0.8

Movement intentions in the next 6 months
% of households by where they most want to move to within the next six months:
- 88% Remain in the current location
- 4% Move into the Government Transitional Shelter
- 3% Don’t know

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: 74%
2. Heavy damage to house: 33%
3. Fear that land is still unsafe: 14%

Protection of Women’s Needs

- 15% of households contained at least one pregnant or lactating woman

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.

Disabilities, Elderly, Minorities

- 5% 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

- 52% 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:
- 83% House
- 5% Apartment
- 3% Transitional shelter (individual)
- 3% Makeshift Shelter
- 6% Tent
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

- 75% 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:
- 38% Household owns the land
- 8% Written agreement (still valid)
- 1% Written agreement (expired)
- 53% Verbal/no agreement
- 0% Don’t know
- 0% Other

- 5% of households reported that they were at risk of being forced to leave where they were staying at the time of data collection

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:  

1. Request to vacate from owner of building/land. 75%
2. Authorities requested our household to leave. 55%
3. Local community does not accept them 33%

6% of households reported having lost the ownership documents for their original shelter before the disaster.

Preferred Shelter Assistance

77% 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 62%
2. Building materials (concrete, wood) 45%
3. None 14%

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

1. Cooking utensils/kitchen set; 65%
2. Bedding items (bedsheets, pillows); 51%
3. Mattresses/Sleeping mats 32%

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 16%
- Water tank/trucking 2%
- Bottled water 22%
- Unprotected source 6%
- Don’t know 2%

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

88% 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 12%
- 10–20 minutes 5%
- More than 20 minutes 3%
- Don’t know 0%

Hygiene practices

% of households by location used for hand washing:

- Pouring device/sink faucet 63%
- Basin/bucket 29%
- No device 8%
- Don’t know 0%

90% 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 72%
- Communal latrine/toilet 16%
- Open defecation 10%
- Don’t know 2%

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

- Flush toilet 99%
- Other 1%
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% of households reporting that the household main income was unemployment, before and after the disaster:

**Before Disaster**  
10% are unemployed

**January 2019**  
17% are unemployed

Main reported barriers to finding work:

- The recent disaster destroyed previous business/job opportunities (43%)
- Available jobs are too far away (16%)
- Only low-skilled, socially degrading, dangerous, or low-paid jobs are available (10%)

There is an average reported loss of 10% of household income due to the disaster.

---

**Communal latrine conditions**

- 76% of households with communal latrines reported their toilet had adequate lighting
- 2% of households with communal toilets reported that there are separate toilets for men and women
- 69% of households with communal toilets reported their toilet is not inside the household and has locks on the doors

**Waste disposal**

- 12% Bin in household / street
- 2% Bury garbage
- 46% Burn garbage
- 24% Open area designated for waste
- 15% Open area not designated for waste
- 1% Other

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

- 32% Daily
- 33% Weekly
- 2% More than 1x per week
- 30% Service not available
- 3% Don’t know
- 0% Other

---

**Food Security**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Score16</th>
<th>average rCSI score17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Economy**

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% Small business owner</td>
<td>1 Small business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Agricultural</td>
<td>2 Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Unemployed</td>
<td>3 Unemployed</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 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:  
- Purchased with own cash: 88%
- Gift from family or friends: 5%
- Food assistance (government): 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:

1. School was damaged or destroyed by the September earthquake/tsunami: 31%
2. Fear of school collapsing: 26%
3. The household is displaced and the school is too far: 10%

### Condition of school facilities

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

- Good condition: 18%
- Lightly damaged: 20%
- Moderately damaged: 27%
- Severe damage: 13%
- Don’t know: 17%
- Other: 5%

### Health

#### Immunization

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

#### Illness and injury

48% 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:

1. Coughing: 43%
2. Fever: 42%
3. Other health issue: 22%

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

- No issues: 78%
- Cost of medicine/treatment too high: 10%
- No medicine/treatment available: 4%

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

1. Get regular medications: 40%
2. None: 39%
3. Treat health problems: 33%

### Priority Needs

Top 3 most important priority needs as reported by households:

1. Food: 83%
2. Kitchen ware: 36%
3. Shelter support: 35%

### Communication with Communities

#### Information Needs

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

- Humanitarian assistance: 36%
- Status of housing: 26%
- Livelihoods: 19%

---

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:\(^{21}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face communication (e.g. from friends)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanitarian assistance

36% 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 94%
2. Tents 17%
3. Tarpaulin 17%

% of households by most common reported source of aid:\(^{23}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government distribution</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO distribution</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organization</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64% 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:\(^{23}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity not enough</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in aid delivery</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid received is not useful</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{21}\) 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.