Rohingya women:
How gender impacts key concerns and complaints

Throughout 2019 so far, access to relief items, cooking fuel and equipment and shelter remain the main issues of concern for both Rohingya men and women, followed by water and site-related problems. This analysis explores the concerns among women in different camps to see how their concerns vary from men in those camps.

Source: Community feedback data from IOM from January 2019 to May 2019 from camps 9, 10, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 together with additional data from November and December 2018 from camps 8, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 19 and focus group discussions conducted by BBC Media Action in camp 9 in June and in camp 10 in July 2019.

Total Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,006</td>
<td>8,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56%)</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of FGDs with women: 4
Age 18-25 years: 2 groups
Age 26+ years: 2 groups
Rohingya women’s concerns are more likely to be focused on access to non-food items, cooking, and shelter. This scenario is similar in most camps, although there are some geographical anomalies which are highlighted below.

**Access to relief items**

Analysis\(^1\) found that women are more concerned about problems related to relief goods. They are 1.6 times more likely to raise issues about relief goods than men, particularly around NFI kits.

Women particularly mentioned their need for hygiene kits (which include soap and toothpaste) and dignity kits (which include soap, sanitary towels, undergarments, scarf, maxi dress, and thami\(^2\)). Although most people did not mention the names of the kits, they mentioned the products that they felt they needed. They said that since arriving in Bangladesh, each household has only received a hygiene kit two or three times. The contents of the kit need to be shared between all the female members of a family which they found difficult. As most of the items in the kits distributed to them have now been used, they need to buy additional items, which is difficult due to lack of money. People said that they had informed their mahji about this problem, but that the problem had not been resolved. People also said that they struggled to collect these kits. Only women can collect the kits from distribution points, and they find it difficult to wait in the queue for a long time, especially for older female members of the family.

**SCOPE Card**

Another particular concern for women relates to the SCOPE card\(^3\). Participants explained that they receive rice, oil, and lentils but they also buy food using the scope card. They said that the money is sometimes not transferred on to the card on schedule so they can’t buy food when they need it. Some people also said that they had not yet received their cards. Complaints were also raised about the high price of some food items, and the low quality of some food available, like dry pepper and dried fish. There is a rumour that some people are getting sick after eating these items. Some participants also complained that the quantity of food they are receiving has decreased.

> We don’t get enough food. The quantity has decreased compared to earlier.\(^*\)

– Woman, 46, camp 10

**Geographical anomalies**

Only in camp 10, problems related to the accessibility of the site ranked third highest in issues raised by women. Participants expressed concerns about the condition of the pathways and the stairways in camp 10, which they say have resulted in accidents. They say they have asked mahjis and NGOs to repair them several times but nothing has been done. Participants also said they had informed the CIC office that drains close to shelters are clogged and are spreading bad odors, but no action has been taken.

Although more often raised by men, water-related problems ranked highly as key issues for women in camps 22, 24 and 25.

---

1. Logistic regression
2. Traditional Burmese dress for women
Shelter materials

Participants said they have only received one shelter kit (which includes bamboo, tarpaulin and rope) since they arrived in Bangladesh. Over time, their shelters have become damaged. The tarpaulin distributed has torn, water enters their house when there is rain and people are worried that their shelter will be destroyed in strong winds. Women said they are desperately in need of items like tarpaulin, bamboo and rope to repair their shelters. People are worried about the monsoon season, as they fear it will further damage their shelters. According to participants, women face more problems and risks regarding shelters than men, as they spend more time inside. Quantitative data shows that shelter related problems are one of the major concerns for Rohingya women in most of the camps.

“Most of the time we are staying in the shelter, men are roaming outside all day...if the shelter breaks, we will not survive.”
– Woman, 30, camp 10

Other major relief-related concerns for women

- **Need for clothing:** Participants said they had only received clothes once, and that they now need more clothes to go outside the house and for prayer.

- **Problems with collecting and transporting relief goods:** Participants said that they were facing problems bringing food from the distribution centres to their house. Sometimes, they spend BDT 50-60 paying someone to carry food to their house. Participants said waiting in the queue for a long time to collect relief is a problem, especially for women with babies and older people.

- **Concerns about firewood** are still prevalent amongst women in most of the areas analysed, although this appears to be less of an issue for women living in camps 10 and 22. Women are particularly worried about smoke from burning trash causing them to get sick, irritating their eyes and making it difficult to cook.

Is the Rohingya response delivering on community engagement and accountability?

Humanitarian actors working across the Rohingya response have made clear their commitment to engaging with and being accountable to refugees and affected host communities. There are many initiatives being undertaken, both by individual agencies and by the response as a whole – including What Matters? itself. But how effective are these schemes? Is the response really delivering on the JRP commitment to enhance accountability to affected populations as a cross-cutting element throughout the response?

New research recently undertaken by the common service suggests that some progress is being made. There is a dramatic increase in the number of refugees who say they now have enough information to make decisions about their daily lives: the percentage jumped from 23% in 2017 to 92% in the recent study. However, large numbers of refugees still report confusion over how to access several services and meet basic needs; and need more and better information about what is happening in Myanmar / Rakhine and long-term options for their and their children’s futures.

Research focusing on the work of practitioners and organisations responding to the crisis found evidence that programme decisions are beginning to be influenced by community views and feedback; and that good use is being made of collective products and services, supporting practitioners to communicate with communities more effectively. But there is still a gap between what the response overall aspires to and what is happening at field level, in some areas.

The latest Needs & Population Monitoring dataset reinforces this mixed picture and suggests a complex geographical situation – with access to both information and complaints / feedback mechanisms varying across camps. Analysis of the NPM data\(^2\) suggests some interesting insights:

---

1. Full reports are available at: [http://www.shongjog.org.bd/news/i/?id=0993b68f-be04-46dd-a76f-b0a54e60504b](http://www.shongjog.org.bd/news/i/?id=0993b68f-be04-46dd-a76f-b0a54e60504b)

2. Analysis is based on questions related to information provision and accessibility of feedback and complaints systems, which were asked to key informants across all camps. Analysis has excluded data from four camps where cell counts were too low for meaningful conclusions to be drawn (4 Ext, 23, Kutapalong RC and Nayapara RC).
• Strong performance, relative to the response overall, can be seen in camps 3, 4, 5, 11, 17, 20 Ext and 24. Key informants in all of these camps reported better than average performance in all four of the key metrics measured by NPM 153.

• Weaker performance is evident in some areas. In particular, camps 1W, 6, 8E, 9, 20, 21 and 26 show lower than average performance in all four metrics.

• Some camps appear to be performing well in certain areas, but less in others. For example, camps 1E, 8W and 14 are performing relatively well in terms of information provision; but less well in terms of communities’ access to feedback and complaints systems. Conversely, camps 7, 16 and 22 are performing relatively strongly in terms of accessibility of feedback mechanisms but less well in terms of information about services available to refugees.

There are, of course, likely to be multiple reasons for these variations and, as the response enters its third year, the common service will be seeking to help address some of these geographical gaps, as well as looking to better support under-served demographic populations who don’t currently have sufficient access to two-way communication and engagement services. As always, agencies wishing to request help with particular aspects of their own community engagement and accountability processes and practice are welcome to contact us for support – please email info@cxbfeedback.org for details.

3 (1) Do the majority of people have options to make a complaint or provide feedback about humanitarian services? (2) Do aid providers take the majority of people in this location’s opinions into account when providing aid services? (3) Do the majority of people in this location know what services are available in the area? (4) Have the majority of people in this location ever seen/heard/know any communication/awareness materials?