**Key Sectoral Findings - Gaza**

**CONTEXT**

Driven by the longstanding Israeli blockade, internal Palestinian political divides, and recurrent escalations of violence between Israel and Palestinian armed groups, the Gaza Strip (hereafter also referred to as Gaza) is in a state of chronic humanitarian crisis. The humanitarian needs of its more than 2 million residents were further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and the escalation of hostilities in May 2021, which negatively impacted livelihoods and access to essential services in Gaza.

With an estimated 1.32 million people in Gaza assessed to be in need of humanitarian assistance (63.0% of Gaza residents)*, the need for granular multi-sectoral data highlighting linkages in sectoral needs and enabling inter-sectoral analysis remains high.

The first Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment (MSNA), conducted by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and facilitated by REACH, in the aftermath of the May 2021 escalation of violence in Gaza, represented an important step in filling information gaps in the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt). To further facilitate evidence based response planning, the 2022 MSNA timing aligns with key milestones in the 2022 Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC).

The first Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment (MSNA), conducted by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and facilitated by REACH, in the aftermath of the May 2021 escalation of violence in Gaza, represented an important step in filling information gaps in the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt). To further facilitate evidence based response planning, the 2022 MSNA timing aligns with key milestones in the 2022 Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC).

**METHODOLOGY**

Data for the MSNA was collected by the data collection partner, the Palestinian Central Bureau for Statistics (PCBS), between May 30th to July 6th of 2022, by means of an in-person household level survey. The MSNA relied on a quantitative methodology, and the survey tool was designed in close collaboration with OCHA and representatives of the humanitarian clusters active in the oPt (Food Security, Health, Shelter, WASH, Education, and Protection), as well as other key stakeholders.

The target population included in the MSNA covers the entirety of the oPt, including the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip. 8,331 households were randomly selected for participation in the assessment by the data collection partner (PCBS) based on a stratified cluster sampling approach. In the Gaza Strip, the sample was stratified at the locality level (including refugee camps) to be representative at a 95% level of confidence and 9% margin of error. Full disaggregation of each indicator can be found in the oPt MSNA Preliminary Analysis Tables.

**KEY FINDINGS**

Livelihoods as a main driver of need

The high rate of unemployment and lack of economic opportunities appears to be linked directly and indirectly to many of the key issues faced by households as identified through the MSNA data. This appears to be increasing the dependency of Gaza households on aid/assistance and contributing to the high reliance of Gaza households on negative coping mechanisms.

High aid dependency and high reliance on negative coping mechanisms

Although the severity of core sectoral needs may at a superficial glance appear relatively low, aid dependency in Gaza is extremely high and creates a very fragile state of stability. Similarly, even though a relatively large number of households appears to be meeting their very basic needs, a high percentage of them (including aid-recipient households) are employing negative coping mechanisms (e.g. taking on debt) in order to meet their most basic needs, thereby further exacerbating their vulnerabilities.

*Indicators marked with an asterix throughout this factsheet booklet represent indicators for which respondents could select multiple answer choices, and/or for which not all answer choices have been presented on the factsheet (most commonly reported). Percentages may hence not add up to 100%. The full breakdown for all answer choices can be found in the MSNA 2022 Preliminary Analysis Tables.

---

*OCHA, Humanitarian Needs Overview 2022

---

**OCHA, Humanitarian Needs Overview 2022**
When analysing food security indicators, such as the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), in the context of Gaza, it is crucial to consider the large scale of food assistance provided. Of the 73.2% of Gaza households that reported having received humanitarian aid in the 6 months prior to the MSNA data collection, 93.7% reported having received food assistance (whether in-kind or in the form of vouchers). With high rates of unemployment (60.3% of Gaza households reported having at least one member of their household unable to find work), 81.0% of Gaza households reported challenges to being able afford their household’s basic needs in the 30 days prior to data collection, and 50.5% reported relying on aid and assistance as their primary source of income. These factors, combined with the high levels of negative coping strategies employed by households, as measured through the Livelihood Coping Strategies Index (LCSI) and reduced Consumption Coping Strategies Index (rCSI), paint a more dire picture of household food security in Gaza and reliance on humanitarian assistance than that which is initially apparent only by looking at the 35.0% of households classified to have experienced little to no food insecurity according to the FIES.

% of households per Livelihood Coping Strategy (LCS)\(^4\) category in the 30 days prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households employing crisis or emergency livelihood coping strategies, by refugee status *:

- Out of camp refugee households: 77.1%
- In-camp refugee households: 72.3%
- Non-refugee households: 67.2%

% of households that employed livelihood coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection by most frequently reported coping strategy employed*:

- Buying food/non-food on credit (incur debt): 71.1%
- Borrowed money for food: 54.4%
- Reduced expenses on health: 52.2%
- Reduced or ceased payments on utilities: 45.7%
- Used savings: 21.0%

1 As applied in the oPt MSNA, based on guidance from the oPt Food Security Cluster, the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) is a household level measure of experience-based food insecurity, with household level food insecurity classified as either little to none, moderate to severe, or severe based on affirmative responses to a series of questions measured over a 30 day recall period.
Food Security and Livelihoods

FOOD EXPENDITURE & FOOD AID

55.7% of household expenditure (in cash or credit) was reportedly spent on food in the 30 days prior to data collection, with households spending a median amount of 575 New Israeli Shekels (NIS) on food.

Median amount of estimated monthly food expenditure by gender of the head of household:

- Female-headed households: 380 NIS
- Male-headed households: 575 NIS

13.6% of households reported spending more than 75.0% of their total monthly household expenditure on basic needs.

LIVELIHOODS AND EMPLOYMENT

% of households that reported a member of their household being unemployed and looking for work at the time of the data collection:

- Deir al Balah: 70.2%
- Gaza: 54.9%
- Khan Yunis: 56.1%
- North Gaza: 63.3%
- Rafah: 65.5%

% of households by most frequently reported primary income sources:

- NGO or charity assistance: 50.5%
- Daily labour: 36.7%
- Employment: 28.1%
- Support from community/family/friends: 18.6%

% of households by reported change in typical monthly household income in the year prior to data collection:

- Income decreased: 57.3%
- No change to income: 33.9%
- Income increased: 3.7%
- Income permanently lost: 3.8%
- Income temporarily lost: 1.2%

% of households by reported obstacles to any female members of their household finding work:

- Lack of opportunities for women: 29.0%
- Lack of consent from husband/guardian: 19.2%
- Childcare unavailable/unaffordable: 17.5%

% of households by reported obstacles to any member of their household finding work:

- Increased competition, not enough jobs: 64.1%
- Only low-skilled, low-paying jobs: 23.1%
- Underqualified for available jobs: 20.1%

% of households that reported their household having recently taken on debt for any reason in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Basic household expenditure: 38.2%
- Shelter reconstruction: 14.0%
- Food: 12.0%
- Healthcare: 8.3%

ABILITY TO MEET BASIC NEEDS

% of households reporting difficulties meeting essential needs because they could not afford them in the 30 days prior to data collection:

- Essential food needs: 70.0%
- Health needs (medication or treatment): 65.0%
- Utilities: 54.8%
- Communication needs (phone credit, internet): 54.7%
- Transport services: 47.5%
- Shelter needs (rent, furniture, construction): 45.2%
- Education needs (tuition fees, books etc.): 44.1%

% of households by most frequently reported primary reason for taking on debt (of those 83.4% households that reported having any outstanding debt) at the time of the data collection:

- Basic household expenditure: 38.2%
- Shelter reconstruction: 14.0%
- Food: 12.0%
- Healthcare: 8.3%

% of households that reported their household having recently taken on debt for any reason in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Basic household expenditure: 38.2%
- Shelter reconstruction: 14.0%
- Food: 12.0%
- Healthcare: 8.3%

INCOME

% of households by primary income sources:

- NGO or charity assistance: 50.5%
- Daily labour: 36.7%
- Employment: 28.1%
- Support from community/family/friends: 18.6%

% of households that reported their household having recently taken on debt:

- 79.0%

---

2 The median amount presented here should be understood as an estimation only, based on the household’s understanding of food prices and value in their local market and includes an estimation of expenditure and any in-kind food aid received by the household.

3 The reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI) measures coping mechanisms employed by households when there was not enough food or money to buy food in the 7 days prior to data collection. ‘Low’ is to be interpreted positively. The methodology presented for the rCSI here is based on contextual adaptations by the oPt Food Security Cluster.

4 The Livelihood Coping Strategies Index (LCSI) measures the extent to which households relied on livelihoods based coping mechanisms in response to a lack of food or money to buy food in the 30 days prior to data collection, either by reporting having utilized such a coping mechanism or having already exhausted its use in the past. Livelihood coping strategies are categorized as ‘none’, ‘stress’, ‘crisis’, or ‘emergency’ based on severity within the context, based on guidance by the oPt Food Security Cluster.

5 Due to a lack of financial or other resources.
In the 3 months prior to the MSNA data collection, 89.6% of Gaza households reported a member of their household having a healthcare need requiring care - with 99.8% of these households reporting a barrier to care. The most commonly reported barrier to care was cost of services being too high (experienced by 76.8% of households), followed by households who reported that treatment was not available (22.1%) and who reported medicines were not available (19.4%). When asked where households would seek primary care for a non-emergency issue, the majority of households (59.2%) reported that they would seek care at a United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) facility because of availability of medicines (70.1%), insurance covering care at this facility (48.0%), and because they cannot afford other options (36.7%). The second most utilized service provider was Ministry of Health facilities (35.2%). Of the 90.2% of Gaza households that reported being covered by health insurance, 56.0% were covered by UNRWA insurance. With 50.3% of households reporting that a member of their household had a chronic illness, and 18.7% of households including a pregnant or lactating household member at the time of the MSNA data collection, the need for specialised medical care is apparent. 21.0% of households were assessed (based on the standard Washington Group Short Set questions) to have at least one member of their household having a disability (of which 9.3% of households were assessed to have at least one child above 5 years of age with a disability).

**HEALTHCARE ACCESS**

% of households considered in need based on difficulties experienced when trying to access health services, by governorate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>% of HHs with difficulties accessing healthcare (distance and barriers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>61 - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Younis</td>
<td>61 - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>0 - 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>61 - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir Al-Balah</td>
<td>0 - 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEALTHCARE NEEDS & BARRIERS**

% of households that reported a member of their household having a healthcare need in the 3 months prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>% of Households with Healthcare Need in the 3 Months Prior to Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed households</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-headed households</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with member with disability</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with no member with disability</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 89.6% of households with a reported healthcare need, % of households that felt they received the care needed in the 3 months prior to data collection, by population group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>% of Households That Felt They Received the Care Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed households</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-headed households</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee households</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refugee households</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 89.6% of households that reported accessing healthcare services in the 3 months prior to data collection, 99.7% reported encountering any kind of barriers when trying to access healthcare services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>% of Households That Felt They Received the Care Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed households</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-headed households</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with member with disability</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with no member with disability</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee households</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refugee households</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households that encountered barriers to accessing healthcare, by most commonly reported barrier:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>% of Households with Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of services too high</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment not available</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine not available</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance/transportation constraints</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of care</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households per distance to the closest health facility by regular mode of transport:

- 62.5% 0 - 14 min
- 30.1% 15 - 29 min
- 7.0% 30 - 59 min
- 0.3% 1 - 3 hrs
HEALTHCARE ACCESS (CONTINUED)

% of households reporting where they would seek primary care if a member of their household had a non-emergency need:

- UNRWA - fixed facility: 59.2%
- Ministry of Health - fixed facility: 35.2%
- Private: 3.5%
- NGO - fixed facility: 1.7%

% of households by commonly reported reasons for seeking care at the above primary care facility*:

- Availability of medicines: 70.1%
- Insurance covers care at this facility: 48.0%
- Cannot afford other options: 36.7%

Of the 90.2% of all Gaza households that reported being covered by health insurance, 56.0% were covered by UNRWA insurance.

CHRONIC ILLNESS

% of household that reported any member of their household having a chronic illness*:

- Female-headed households: 69.3%
- Male-headed households: 51.6%

HEALTHCARE & GENDER

18.7% of households (799 HHs) reported having a member of their household that was pregnant or lactating at the time of data collection.

% of households reporting that women of reproductive age (15 - 49 years) had no access barriers to specialised reproductive health services*:

- 86.1%

Of the 8.2% of female-headed households (799 HHs) in Gaza, 27.3% were assessed to include a member of their household having a disability, compared to 20.4% of the 91.8% of male-headed households.

DISABILITY

21.0% of households (788 HHs) were assessed to include at least a member of their household having a disability, and 9.3% of households were assessed to have at least one child (age 5 - 17) in the household having a disability.

Healthcare needs and barriers

Among the 21.0% of households with one or more members with disabilities:

% of households that reported a member of their household having a healthcare need in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- 96.1%

% of households reporting that the household did not have health insurance coverage:

- 10.7%

Of those 96.1% of households assessed to have a member of the household with disability that reported a healthcare need, 99.7% reported a barrier to accessing healthcare.

Cost of services too high: 77.6%
Treatment not available: 28.1%
Medicine not available: 21.4%

Livelihoods and employment

Among the 21.0% of households with one or more members with disabilities:

% of households with a member of the household with a disability reporting an unemployed adult member of the household:

- 62.3%

Only low-skilled, socially degrading, dangerous, or low-paying jobs being available was cited as a barrier to employment by 11.2% of these households.

1 Each household was assigned a severity score based on the combining factors of distance to the nearest primary healthcare facility (using their regular mode of transport) and barriers that prevented a member of their household from accessing health services. The population of reference for households experiencing a barrier to healthcare consisted of households that reported a healthcare need (89.6%), as the follow-up question on barriers was only asked to those households. For more information on the analysis completed for mapping, refer to Indicator 1 included in the table in Annex 1: Mapped Indicators.

2 To align with the global JIAF guidance, the oPt MSNA asked households how long it took them to reach the nearest health facility using their regular mode of transport (which could capture walking, bus, driving a car etc.). The same phrasing was used for the indicators on length of time taken to reach the nearest primary or secondary school.

3 This question was asked to all households, as it was considered general knowledge within the community. The answer choice “Don’t know” was given by 2.3% of households. Specialized reproductive services include, but are not limited to, family planning, sexual health education, maternal healthcare etc.

4 E.g. Diabetes, chronic lung disease, heart disease, hypertension etc.

5 See Annex 2 on page 18 for information on how disability was assessed within the scope of the MSNA data collection.
Although 95.1% of Gaza households reported having access to water on their premises, the majority of households (82.6%) were reliant on unimproved water sources for their drinking water at the time of the data collection. While 94.7% of Gaza households were able to use piped water into compound as their main water source for domestic purposes, only 3.2% of households were able to use piped water into compound for drinking, confirming that tap water in private homes is generally not potable or safe for consumption. Reliance on water trucking (82.5%) and piped water connected to a public tap (13.0%) were the most commonly reported main sources of drinking water for Gaza households. While 92.2% of households reported having access to sufficient quantities of water for drinking and domestic purposes, high rates of households employing negative coping mechanisms in order to cope with a lack of water were also observed - with 84.9% of households employing a coping mechanism related to water consumption. The most commonly reported negative coping mechanism employed by households to cope with a lack of water was receiving water on credit (48.9%). 5.7% of households reported drinking water intended for domestic use - potentially increasing risk for the spread of waterborne diseases or exposure to hazardous chemical substances.

Nearly all households (99.7%) reported having access to functional and improved sanitation facilities at the time of the data collection. Most households (86.5%) were connected to a sewage system for latrine waste drainage, with 10.7% of households reportedly using a covered cesspit. The most used system for disposing of solid waste was municipal waste collection (93.0%) followed by dumping of waste in official dump locations (4.8%).

### WATER ACCESS & AVAILABILITY

% of household relying on unimproved water sources for drinking water, by governorate

![Map of Gaza governorates showing % of HHs relying on unimproved water sources for drinking water](map.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of HHs relying on unimproved water sources for drinking water</th>
<th>Deir Al-Balah</th>
<th>Gaza</th>
<th>Khan Younis</th>
<th>North Gaza</th>
<th>Rafah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 80%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 100%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAIN WATER SOURCES

% of households by reported main source of drinking water used at the time of data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Water</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water trucking</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water connected to public tap</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water into compound/home</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled water</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COPING WITH A LACK OF WATER

% of households by reported coping mechanism employed to cope with a lack of water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Mechanism</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive water on credit</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce water consumption</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No coping mechanism needed</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify hygiene practices</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase spending on water</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink water for domestic use</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For the purpose of the oPt MSNA, based on guidance with the WASH cluster, improved water sources were classified as including piped water directly into the home/compound, piped water connected to a public tap or filling point, protected well, protected spring, and bottled water. Unimproved water sources included protected and unprotected rainwater tank, illegal connection to piped water, water trucking, unprotected well, unprotected spring, and surface water without pre-treatment (pond, lake, river, dam, canal, stream etc.).
SANITATION & HYGIENE

% of households with access to a functional and improved sanitation facility at the time of the data collection:

- Toilet paper: 41.6%
- Soap: 94.6%
- Niagara: 95.8%
- Handwashing station: 97.1%
- Bidet: 97.3%
- Toilet seat: 99.4%

% of households reporting the permanent availability of all listed sanitation items (toilet seat, niagara, handwashing station, bidet, toilet paper, soap):

- Toilet paper: 41.6%
- Soap: 94.6%
- Niagara: 95.8%
- Handwashing station: 97.1%
- Bidet: 97.3%
- Toilet seat: 99.4%

IMPACT OF FLOODING

12.0% of Gaza households (502 HHs) reported being affected by flooding in the 3 years prior to the MSNA data collection (of these households 41.2% reported their shelter being impacted by flooding and 87.1% reported floods disrupting their daily activities). For reported incidents of flooding, high levels of variation were observed between the different localities assessed in Gaza. Flooding was reported by more than 20.0% of households in the following localities in North Gaza governorate: Umm Naser (47.0%), Beit Lahiya (33.1%), Jabalya (32.1%), Beit Hanun (30.0%), and Jabalya Camp (27.7%). Flooding was also reported by more than 20.0% of households in the following localities in Khan Yunis governorate: Abasan Jadida (30.9%) and Al Fukhari (20.8%). Of particular note is that Umm Naser, the locality with the highest observed rate of households reporting flooding events, was also the locality with the highest reported rate (14.5%) of households living under critical shelter conditions across all Gaza localities (11.1% in makeshift shelters and 3.4% in unfinished shelters), leaving households particularly vulnerable to the effects of flooding.

IMPACT OF FLOODING

Of the 12.0% of households (502 HHs) affected by floods, 41.2% of households reported that their shelter or the area surrounding their shelter had been impacted, and 87.1% reported that their daily activities had been negatively impacted by floods in the 3 years prior to data collection.

% of households of the 12.0% households affected by floods by most commonly reported ways in which floods affected their shelter:

- None: 58.8%
- Water leaking into shelter: 33.6%
- Damage of furniture: 29.7%
- Damage to shelter items: 21.2%
- Damage to shelter surroundings: 6.5%

% of households of the 12.0% households affected by floods, by most commonly reported mitigation measures taken to reduce the risk of flooding:

- None: 84.5%
- Shelter rehabilitation/strengthening: 10.9%
- Built walls/tunnels around shelter: 4.8%
- Leaving shelter or moving location: 0.8%

% of households of the 12.0% households affected by floods, by most commonly reported ways in which floods affected their daily activities:

- Children could not get to school: 56.5%
- Adults could not get to work: 26.9%
- Electricity/water services affected: 18.9%
- People getting sick: 18.7%
- None: 12.9%
- Restricted access to health facility: 12.3%
- Sewer flooding occured in area: 10.0%
- Livelihoods affected: 6.5%

3.0% of households reported observing stagnant sewage accumulation for more than 3 days out of the 7 days prior to data collection.

% of households by reported latrine waste drainage system in use by the household:

- Sewage system: 86.5%
- Covered cesspit: 10.7%
- Covered septic tank: 1.6%
- Hand-dug hole: 1.0%
- Open area: 0.1%

% of households by reported solid waste disposal system in use by the household:

- Municipal waste collection: 93.0%
- Dumped in official dump location: 4.8%
- Openly dumped on premises: 1.4%
- Dumped in the area: 0.4%
- Burned on premises: 0.3%

7.9% of households reported observing solid waste accumulation for more than 3 days out of the 7 days prior to data collection.

[2] Damage to shelter items due to flooding is defined as including any damage (including minor) to doors, windows, floors, ceilings or other shelter items/structures.
With a population density of 5,800 persons per km², the Gaza Strip is one of the world’s most densely populated areas, suffering from a chronic housing shortage, high costs/unavailability of construction material due to restrictions imposed by the Israeli blockade, and recurrent escalations of violence (HNO 2022). 1.6% of Gaza households were reported to be living in inadequate shelters at the time of the MSNA data collection, and 59.8% of households reported existing shelter damage, defects, or issues. The impact of the May 2021 escalation of violence on shelter conditions in Gaza remains apparent one year later, with 37.3% of households reporting that their shelter was damaged during the escalation and 44.4% of households reporting having taken any kind of measure to protect themselves or their shelter from armed conflict. Shelter repair (14.0%) was the second most frequently reported primary reason for taking on debt by households in Gaza, and when asked about their preferred type of humanitarian aid or assistance 9.4% of households preferred in-kind NFIs and 5.7% of households had a preference for shelter assistance.

**SHELTER DAMAGE, DEFECTS & ISSUES**

% of households with any reported shelter damage, defects, or issues by governorate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>% of HHs reporting shelter damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deir al-Balah</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Naser (North Gaza)</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bureij (Deir al-Balah)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghazi Camp (Deir al-Balah)</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Shoka (Rafah)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasan Jadida (Khan Yunis)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beit Hanun (North Gaza)</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting any type of shelter damage, defects, or issues at the time of data collection:

- Some cracks in some walls: 42.7%
- None: 76.2%
- Opening or cracks in roof: 30.3%
- Broken or cracked window: 17.3%
- Lack of or bad condition of kitchen: 12.7%
- Poorly ventilated/bad smells: 11.5%
- Lack of or bad condition of bathroom: 9.2%
- Damaged floors: 8.6%
- Gas, water or sewage damaged: 7.5%
- Dark and gloomy: 7.1%
- Exterior doors broken/unable to shut: 5.7%
- Lack of privacy: 4.9%
- Insufficient partition between rooms: 4.0%
- Exterior doors or windows missing: 3.2%
- Large cracks/openings in most walls: 3.0%
- HH member sleeping outside or on floor: 1.9%
- Roof partially collapsed: 1.0%
- Dangerous or exposed location: 0.3%
- Some walls fully collapsed: 0.2%

% of households reporting some type of shelter damage, defects, or issues by governorate:

- Deir al-Balah: 81.2%
- Gaza: 76.7%
- Khan Yunis: 74.0%
- North Gaza: 73.2%
- Rafah: 73.2%
- Umm Naser (North Gaza): 74.0%
- Al Bureij (Deir al-Balah): 73.2%
- Maghazi Camp (Deir al-Balah): 73.2%
- Ash Shoka (Rafah): 73.2%
- Abasan Jadida (Khan Yunis): 73.2%
- Beit Hanun (North Gaza): 73.1%

% of households taking on debt in the 3 months prior to data collection reporting shelter repair/reconstruction as the primary reason by governorate:

- Deir al-Bala: 15.5%
- Gaza: 12.3%
- Khan Yunis: 17.9%
- North Gaza: 13.9%
- Rafah: 11.1%

1 This map represents the % of households in each Gaza governorate that reported any shelter damage, defects, or other shelter issues.
2 This includes (but is not limited to) shelter locations such as those located inside of the Access Restricted Areas (ARA) or in places prone to recurrent flooding, nearby waste dumping sites or waste water overflow areas.
SHELTER TYPE & OCCUPANCY STATUS

% of households, by reported shelter type:
- Solid/finished apartment: 75.2%
- Solid/finished house: 23.2%
- Unfinished/non-enclosed building: 1.4%
- Makeshift shelter: 0.2%
- Collective shelter: 0.0%
- Tent: 0.0%
- None (sleeping in open): 0.0%

% of households reportedly living in inadequate shelters at the time of the data collection:
1.6%

% of households reporting overcrowded shelter conditions (85 HHs) - at least one household member sleeping in living rooms or other common areas:
1.9%

% of households, per reported occupancy arrangement in their shelter:
- Ownership: 83.5%
- Hosted without rent: 10.6%
- Rented: 5.2%
- Disputed ownership (Palestinian actor): 0.6%
- No occupancy agreement/squatting: 0.1%

% of households (331 HHs) reporting that their household is at risk of eviction at the time of data collection:
8.9%

% of the 8.9% (331 HHs) of households reportedly at risk of eviction by most commonly reported reasons for fearing eviction:
- Disputed ownership: 28.9%
- Lack of funds: 27.2%
- Inadequate shelter conditions: 17.2%

SHELTER & CONFLICT

% of households reporting that they had taken measures to protect themselves in case of armed conflict: 44.4%

% of households of the 44.4% of households that reported taking any measures to protect themselves or their shelter in case of armed conflict, by measure:
- Prepare emergency bag: 93.1%
- Identify safest place in shelter: 81.3%
- Prepare safe family evacuation plan: 46.6%
- Know the safety positions to do during bombardment: 43.2%

25.6% of households (1325 HHs) that reported that any member of their household had received information, training, or education on the risk of explosive remnants of war.

MAY 2021 ESCALATION OF HOSTILITIES

37.3% of households reported that their shelter had been damaged by bombardment during the escalation of hostilities in Gaza in May of 2021.

Extent of shelter damage reported by the 37.3% of households that reported damage by bombardment in 2021, by % of households:
- Minor: 93.3%
- Major: 6.0%
- Total: 0.6%

% of assessed households reporting having received assistance for repairs and reconstruction after the May 2021 escalation:
- No assistance received: 78.7%
- Yes, full assistance received: 11.8%
- Yes, partial assistance received: 7.4%
- Yes, not sure if full or partial: 1.9%

Current state of shelter damage reported by the 37.3% of households that reported having been damaged by bombardment in 2021, by % of households:
- Not damaged/no further repairs needed: 54.0%
- Damaged (lack of own resources): 23.6%
- No damage (repaired with assistance): 7.9%
- No damage (repaired own resources): 6.6%
- Damaged (assistance was insufficient): 5.2%

3 Inadequate shelter includes the following answer choices: unfinished building, collective shelters, tents, makeshift shelter, living in the open.
4 Answer choices for this question differed for Gaza and the West Bank based on contextual differences, with ‘disputed ownership (Israeli actor)’ included as an answer choice for West Bank households.
5 Protect themselves, their household members, or their shelter in case of armed conflict.
6 The damage levels reported here are based on the household’s subjective perception, following a one year recall period, and may hence differ from damage assessments conducted in the aftermath of the escalation.
7 Subset of households that reported any level of damage due to bombardment of their shelter during the May 2021 escalation of violence.
Reported rates of school attendance for basic and secondary education were slightly higher for school-aged girls than for school-aged boys, although the difference between girls and boys was more pronounced at the secondary school level, with 94.8% of school aged girls (16-17 years old) attending school compared to 82.9% of school-aged boys (16-17 years old). 5.7% of school-aged children reportedly dropped out of school during the current school year (2021-2022), with 5.3% of all school-aged boys and 2.7% of all school-aged girls reportedly dropping out. Safety concerns for children, both at school and on the way to/from school, were reported by 23.8% of households, with the most commonly reported concern being traffic hazards and crossing roads (85.6% of households with safety concerns). 9.3% of Gaza households reported having a child with a disability, and perceived additional challenges for children with a disability (mental and physical) in accessing educational services were reported by 93.5% of households.

SCHOOL CLOSURES & CATCH-UP LEARNING

% of households reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures due to COVID-19 or other reasons, by governorate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>% of HHs reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir Al-Balah</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Younis</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures due to COVID-19 or other reasons, by household refugee status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Refugee Status</th>
<th>% of HHs reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee households</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refugee households</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures due to COVID-19 or other reasons, by location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of HHs reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Mughraqa (Gaza)</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasan Jadida (Khan Yunis)</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Az Zawayda (Deir al-Balah)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhor Deik (Deir al-Balah)</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis Camp (Khan Yunis)</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE & ENROLMENT

Of the 7.1% of households with school-aged children not attending school, % of households by most frequently reported reasons for non-attendance:

- Cannot afford to pay school related expenses: 35.6%
- Lack of interest (of children) in education: 28.0%
- Illness: 16.5%
- Children working to support household: 9.4%
- School cannot accomodate child with disability: 7.6%

% of school-aged children (5 - 17) reportedly attending school regularly (4 days per week), by gender and age:

- Girls: 94.5% 5-17 years
- Boys: 91.5% 5-17 years
- Girls: 97.5% 6-15 years
- Boys: 95.3% 6-15 years
- Girls: 94.8% 16-17 years
- Boys: 82.9% 16-17 years

% of assessed households with school-aged children planning to enroll all eligible children in school at the beginning of the 2022 - 2023 school year:

- Of the 9.1% of households not planning to enroll school-aged children, % of households by most frequently reported reasons for non-enrolment:

  - Cannot afford school related expenses: 15.2%
  - Child not interested in school: 14.4%
  - School cannot accomodate child with disability: 9.5%
  - Child needs to support family at home: 8.0%

1 This map represents the % of households in each West Bank location that reported a need for catch-up learning due to school closures for any reason, including COVID-19.

2 Age categories are broken down as provided by the Education Cluster: Kindergarten (5 years), basic education 1st to 10th grade (6-15 years), secondary education 11th to 12th grade (16-17 years).

3 Many households (51.5%) answered ‘not applicable’ due to age of their child (under 5).
% of school-aged children (5 - 17 years) who reportedly dropped out of school during the 2021 - 2022 school year:

- % of school-aged girls: 2.7%
- % of school-aged boys: 5.3%

% of assessed households per distance to the closest basic education facility by regular mode of transport:

- 0 - 14 min: 75.4%
- 15 - 30 min: 19.1%
- 30 - 59 min: 4.3%
- 1 - 3 hrs: 0.7%

% of assessed households per distance to the closest secondary education facility by regular mode of transport:

- 0 - 14 min: 47.2%
- 15 - 30 min: 38.7%
- 30 - 59 min: 12.1%
- 1 - 3 hrs: 1.5%

% of school-aged children, of the 5.7% of children (281 children) that dropped out of school during the current school year (2021 - 2022) by most commonly reported reasons for dropping out of school*:

- Girls:
  - Cannot afford costs: 56.5%
  - Lack of interest: 19.1%
  - Disability-specific needs not met: 17.9%
  - Child labour: 13.7%

- Boys:
  - Child labour: 67.7%
  - Cannot afford costs: 66.2%
  - Lack of interest: 49.6%
  - Disability-specific needs not met: 21.9%

% of households* that reported children feeling unsafe or very unsafe when traveling to/from and studying in schools:

- Deir al Balah: 28.9%
- Gaza: 15.3%
- Khan Yunis: 29.6%
- North Gaza: 27.3%
- Rafah: 25.2%

% of households* of the 23.8% of households (1168 HHs) that reported children feeling unsafe or very unsafe when traveling to/from and studying in schools, by type of risk*:

- Traffic hazards/crossing roads: 85.6%
- Harassment traveling to/from school: 14.6%
- Stray animals: 9.7%
- Violence at school: 9.1%
- Environmental hazards: 3.6%
- Risk of sexual violence at school*: 2.1%
- Risk of sexual violence to/from school: 1.6%
- Other: 0.7%
- Attack on school: 0.3%

% of households by most commonly perceived additional challenges faced by children with disability in accessing education*:

- Bullying: 49.7%
- Infrastructure not adapted: 36.3%
- Classrooms not adapted to need: 28.8%
- Transportation constraints: 16.6%
- Teacher training/availability: 16.1%
- Curriculum/material not adapted: 15.9%

% of households reporting psychosocial support (PSS) available at school if needed, by type of PSS:

- Trained counsellors: 66.2%
- No such support available: 15.1%
- Teachers trained on PSS: 10.1%
- Not sure: 9.9%
- Information on external PSS: 0.2%

3 Following guidance from the Education cluster, this question was asked to all households as it was considered general community knowledge. Households that had no knowledge on this topic were recorded as ‘do not know’.

4 Due to contextual differences, some answer choices specifically adapted to the West Bank regarding threats, harassment or violence originating from Israeli settlers were not included for the Gaza Strip.

5 Referring specifically to the risk of sexual and gender-based violence.

6 Asked to all households.

7 See footnote 3 above.
The humanitarian crisis in the oPt is often classified as a protracted protection crisis (HNO 2022) and protection concerns are interwoven to some extent throughout all other sectoral aspects of the MSNA. Particularly telling of the impact of protection related incidents on the well-being of Gaza households is the observation that 40.0% of households reported at least one member of their household experiencing signs of psychosocial distress of trauma in the year prior to data collection. Specific population groups, including women, children, and persons with disability are considered particularly at risk for experiencing protection threats, with 25.3% of households identifying specific safety and security concerns for children, 38.4% of households identifying specific safety and security concerns for children with a disability, and 15.7% of households identifying specific safety and security concerns for women.

### PROTECTION CONCERNS & INCIDENTS

% of households reporting that at least one household member showed signs of psychosocial distress or trauma in the past year, by governorate:

- Gaza: 73.6%
- Khan Yunis: 92.9%
- North Gaza: 89.7%
- Rafah: 74.1%
- Deir al Balah: 73.6%
- Gaza: 90.1%
- Khan Yunis: 92.9%
- North Gaza: 89.7%
- Rafah: 74.1%

% of households reporting that at least one household member showed signs of psychosocial distress or trauma in the past year, by age group:

- At least one child household member (under 18 years): 68.0% (No) 32.0% (Yes)
- At least one adult household member (over 18 years): 15.8% (No) 84.2% (Yes)

% of households of those 17.8% (846 HHs) of households that reported a barrier to accessing services, by most commonly reported reasons why they were prevented from accessing services:

- Cost of accessing service (transport) 34.6%
- Services not physically accessible 23.7%
- Cost of the service 14.2%
- Distance to specialized services 12.1%
- Services difficult to reach 8.1%
- Services provision not adapted 5.5%
- Stigma in community 1.0%

% of households reporting that women of reproductive age (15 - 49 years) had no access barriers to specialized reproductive health services:

- Deir al Balah: 73.6%
- Gaza: 90.1%
- Khan Yunis: 92.9%
- North Gaza: 89.7%
- Rafah: 74.1%

17.8% of households (846 HHs) reported that a member of their household had experienced difficulties in accessing one or more services (e.g. education, health clinics, markets, etc.) due to mental or physical difficulty.

% of households reporting that at least one household member experienced difficulties in accessing one or more services (e.g. education, health clinics, markets, etc.) due to mental or physical difficulty: 40.0%

Of the 40.0% of households reporting that at least one household member showed signs of psychosocial distress or trauma in the past year, % of household members showing psychosocial distress by age group:

- At least one child household member: 68.0% (No) 32.0% (Yes)
- At least one adult household member: 15.8% (No) 84.2% (Yes)

This map represents the % of adults and children in each household by Gaza governorate that were reported to have experienced signs of psychosocial distress or trauma in the past year. Please refer to Annex 1: Indicator Mapping for more information.

Signs of psychosocial distress or trauma can include (but is not limited to) behavioral changes such as nightmares, lasting sadness, extreme fatigue, being often tearful, bedwetting, extreme anxiety, significant social withdrawal, unusual aggressive behavior, decrease in appetite or sleep etc. This indicator is used as a proxy for assessing mental and psychosocial support needs.
SAFETY & SECURITY CONCERNS

% of households by most frequently reported main safety and security concerns for children*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Girls:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Boys:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal harassment</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>Verbal harassment</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife, stray animals</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>Wildlife, stray animals</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment/violence</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households by most frequently reported main safety and security concerns for children with disabilities (including both girls and boys)*:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal harassment</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>Verbal harassment</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife, stray animals</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical harassment/violence</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households reporting areas in their location where women and girls felt unsafe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deir al Balah</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households of the 11.4% of households (742 HHs) reporting areas in their location where women and girls avoid or where they feel unsafe by most frequently reported location*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their way to school</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households of the 11.4% of households (742 HHs) reporting that women and girls avoid or feel unsafe in at least one location, by most frequently reported reasons*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of verbal harassment</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of sexual harassment/violence</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being robbed</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIVELIHOOD COPING STRATEGIES

% of households employing crisis or emergency livelihood coping strategies in the 30 days prior to data collection, by governorate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>0 - 20%</th>
<th>21 - 40%</th>
<th>41 - 60%</th>
<th>61 - 80%</th>
<th>81 - 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deir Al-Balah</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of households per Livelihood Coping Strategy (LCS) category in the 30 days prior to data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCS</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD LABOUR

% of households reporting that a child (under 15 years) worked to contribute to household income due to a lack of food or money to buy it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the 5.3% of school-aged boys (ages 5 - 17) that had reportedly dropped out of school on the current school year (2021 - 2022), 67.7% dropped out due to child labour and of the 2.7% of school-aged girls (ages 5 - 17), 13.7% dropped out due to child labour.</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions were asked to all households, regardless of household composition, as they were considered to cover information that would be general knowledge within a community. For households who were unable to answer these questions due to a lack of knowledge the answer choice ‘do not know’ was recorded.
ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED POPULATIONS (AAP)

A complex combination of factors consisting of deepening poverty and vulnerability, a lack of livelihood opportunities, the coercive environment created by the longstanding Israeli blockade, and internal political divisions continue to exacerbate humanitarian need in the Gaza Strip (HNO 2022). Owing to these circumstances, the need for basic assistance (cash and in-kind) remains high. With 73.2% of households in Gaza reporting having received any form of humanitarian aid or assistance (of which 92.7% received food assistance) in the 6 months prior to the MSNA data collection, the importance of considering accountability to affected populations is evident. The MSNA survey included a number of indicators specifically designed to assess AAP, and results of the MSNA across all sectoral and intersectoral indicators have been disaggregated according to aid-recipient status of the household.

The following factsheet will present a profile for aid-recipient households in Gaza based on the findings of the MSNA data. The information presented in the AAP section of this factsheet booklet should be considered alongside the sectoral findings of the MSNA in order to better contextualize household circumstances and create a more complete picture of household needs and vulnerabilities and the role of humanitarian assistance in the oPt.

ASSISTANCE/AID RECEIVED

% of households reporting having received assistance/aid in the 6 months prior to data collection:

Compared to 66.4% of Gaza households reporting the same during the 2021 MSNA data collection.

Of the 73.2% of households that reported having received assistance/aid in the 6 months prior to data collection, % of households by type of assistance/aid received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assistance/Aid</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash (multi-purpose)</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-food items</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education services</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal items</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability specific hygiene NFIs</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SATISFACTION WITH AID

Among the 73.2% of households that reported having received assistance/aid in the 6 months prior to data collection, % of households that reported being dissatisfied with the assistance/aid they received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Satisfaction</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household with member with disability</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with no member with disability</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AID PREFERENCE

Among the 41.1% of the 73.2% of households that received aid and were not satisfied with the aid/assistance they received in the 6 months prior to data collection, % of households by reasons for dissatisfaction*:

- Quantity not enough: 99.6%
- Quality not good enough: 9.3%
- Delays in delivery of aid: 3.6%

Prefered type of assistance/aid if households were to receive assistance/aid in the future, by % of households*:

- Physical Cash: 70.1%
- Vouchers: 45.8%
- In-kind (food): 32.9%
- Services: 12.7%
- In-kind NFIs: 9.4%
- Provide job opportunities: 8.6%
- Shelter: 5.7%

Preferred type of assistance/aid by female members of the household if households were to receive assistance/aid in the future, by % of households*:

- Physical Cash: 74.2%
- Vouchers: 41.0%
- In-kind (food): 27.3%
- Services: 17.0%
- In-kind NFIs: 11.6%
- Provide job opportunities: 6.9%
- Shelter: 3.7%
AAP

RECEIVING AID IN THE FUTURE

% of households reporting that they would like to receive any form of humanitarian aid or assistance in the future:

- Female-headed households: 99.2%
- Male-headed households: 92.7%
- Refugee households: 92.5%
- Non-refugee households: 90.5%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 92.6%
- Head of household (60 and older): 88.9%
- Household with member with disability: 93.4%
- Household with no member with disability: 91.4%
- Household location - urban: 91.0%
- Household location - camp: 96.9%
- Aid recipient: 99.4%
- Non-aid recipient: 70.9%

Although 41.4% of the 73.2% of Gaza households receiving any form of aid reported dissatisfaction with the aid they received, this was primarily due to quantity of aid not being enough (reported by 99.6% of dissatisfied aid recipient households) and 68.3% of aid-recipient households reported aid as their primary source of income. Despite this seemingly high level of dissatisfaction with aid, 99.4% of aid recipient households nevertheless expressed wanting to continue to receive aid in the future.

AID RECIPIENT PROFILE

Compared to non-aid recipient households, aid recipient households tended to score worse on indicators related to ability to meet basic needs (for more detail, see the MSNA 2022 Preliminary Analysis Tables). This should be considered alongside the higher reported rates of underlying household level vulnerability among aid-recipient households, including on factors such as unemployment, refugee status, female-headed households, or presence of a household member with a disability. These underlying vulnerabilities combined with the reality that many aid-recipient households (68.3%) are reliant on aid as their primary income source, may provide insight into why aid-recipient households reported more challenges to meeting their basic needs.

This appears also to highlight the importance of assistance in sustaining current household circumstances and the risk of households plunging further into need should aid be discontinued.

% of aid and non-aid recipient households by gender of the head of household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male-headed household</th>
<th>Female-headed household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid recipient</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aid recipient</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of aid and non-aid recipient households by household refugee status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-refugee household</th>
<th>Refugee household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid recipient</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aid recipient</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of aid and non-aid recipient households by presence of a household member with a disability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No disability</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid recipient</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aid recipient</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of aid and non-aid recipient households by presence of an unemployed adult household member:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No unemployed adult</th>
<th>Unemployed adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid recipient</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aid recipient</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 70.1% of households reported physical cash as their preferred type of assistance for future aid distributions, compared to only 1.5% of households reporting the same for cash via bank transfer. This indicates that even when households may have an overall preference for cash assistance, it is important to also keep in mind the preferred modality of cash assistance.

2. Vouchers as represented here includes both food vouchers (18.5%) and non-food vouchers (27.3%) for all households and female household members (15.6% and 25.4% respectively).

3. ‘Provide job opportunities’ was not included in the original answer choices of the MSNA questionnaire, but was re-coded as an answer choice following a review of the text-based answers for the open-ended answer choice ‘other’.

4. The question on aid preference for female members of the household was asked by proxy to the respondent, and hence in some cases reflects the perception of a male respondent regarding preferences of female household members on type of aid to be received in possible future aid distributions rather than the actual preference of female household members. This limitation should be kept in mind when considering the results.
Protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA)

**RISK OF SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE (SEA)**

The risk of sexual exploitation and abuse was included as a cross-cutting critical topic throughout numerous sectoral indicators included within the MSNA, related to education, protection, and accountability to affected populations. The risk/fear of verbal harassment and the risk/fear of sexual harassment or violence were among the most frequently reported answer choices for many of these indicators, indicating the prevalence of concerns related to sexual exploitation and abuse among Gaza households. Although such concerns were reported at higher rates for girls and women, the frequency with which such risks and fears were reported for boys and children with disability (regardless of gender) is also alarming.

It should be noted that of the 3.1% of Gaza households (112 HHs) who reported a member of their household having experienced a protection incident in the 6 months prior to data collection, no households reported any member of their household having been affected by an incident related to sexual violence. There is a possibility that such incidents, along with other indicators related to SEA, may be under-reported by households due to the sensitivity of this topic.

**SAFETY & SECURITY CONCERNS RELATED TO SEA**

**Risk of SEA at school and to/from school**

23.8% of households (1168 HHs) reported children feeling unsafe or very unsafe at school or on the way to/from school, and of these households, 2.1% reported a risk of sexual violence at school as one of their concerns and 1.6% reported a risk of sexual violence on the way to/from school.

**Security concerns for disabled children (girls and boys)**

When asked about specific security concerns for disabled children, 9.0% of households (441 HHs) reported a risk of verbal harassment and 3.2% of households (217 HHs) reported a risk of sexual harassment or sexual violence.

**Security concerns for girls**

When asked about specific security concerns for girls, 14.2% of households (752 HHs) reported girls being at risk of verbal harassment and 6.5% of households (391 HHs) reported girls being at risk of sexual harassment or sexual violence.

**Security concerns for boys**

When asked about specific security concerns for boys, 8.5% of households (397 HHs) reported boys being at risk of verbal harassment and 3.2% of households (201 HHs) reported boys being at risk of sexual harassment or sexual violence.

**Security concerns for women**

When asked about specific security concerns for women, 10.7% of households (612 HHs) reported women being at risk of verbal harassment and 4.2% of households (281 HHs) reported women being at risk of sexual harassment or sexual violence.

**LOCATIONS CONSIDERED UNSAFE FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS**

% of households reporting areas in their location where women and girls felt unsafe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deir al Balah</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gaza</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 11.4% of Gaza households (742 HHs) that reported women and girls avoiding specific locations in their area because they felt unsafe there, 5.1% of households reported that women and girls felt unsafe while seeking or receiving humanitarian assistance.

**Reported specific locations avoided**

% of households of the 11.4% of households (742 HHs) reporting areas in their location that women and girls avoid or where they feel unsafe by most frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On their way to school</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/community areas</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for feeling unsafe in specific locations**

Of the 11.4% (742 HHs) of Gaza households that reported women and girls avoiding specific locations in their area because they felt unsafe there, the most frequently reported reasons were fear of verbal harassment (reported by 50.4% of these households) and fear of sexual harassment or violence (reported by 35.0% of these households).
CRM AWARENESS & USE

Of the 21.0% of aid-recipient households (867 HHs) reporting awareness of how to access a complaint or reporting mechanism (CRM), 67.5% reported that they would use existing complaint mechanisms to provide feedback on the assistance/aid they received and/or the way that aid workers behaved in their location.

% of households of the 21.0% of aid-recipient households reporting awareness of CRM that reported having used/engaged with CRM in the 6 months prior to data collection:

Of the 32.3% of the 21.0% of households aware of CRM and stating that they would not use existing complaint mechanisms, % of households by most frequently reported reasons why:

- Complaints do not result in change: 72.0%
- Worry that it would affect future aid: 31.3%
- Lack of transparency in process: 9.8%
- Past negative experience: 3.6%
- Judgement by family or community: 2.1%
- Lack of confidentiality: 0.3%

CRM AWARENESS DISAGGREGATED BY POPULATION GROUP

% of households reporting awareness of how to access and use CRM by population group:

- Female-headed households: 19.1%
- Male-headed households: 21.2%
- Refugee households: 24.0%
- Non-refugee households: 14.4%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 21.4%
- Head of household (60 and older): 19.6%
- Household with member with disability: 18.6%
- Household with no member with disability: 21.8%
- Household location - urban: 19.9%
- Household location - camp: 28.0%

% of households reporting that any member of their household was aware of the aid worker’s code of conduct:

- Female-headed households: 10.0%
- Male-headed households: 10.5%
- Refugee households: 12.2%
- Non-refugee households: 7.2%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 9.3%
- Head of household (60+): 14.8%

% of households reporting that any member of their household was contacted on their preferred ways to report sensitive information by household population group:

- Female-headed households: 3.8%
- Male-headed households: 2.2%
- Refugee households: 2.4%
- Non-refugee households: 2.2%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 2.1%
- Head of household (60 and older): 2.8%
- Household with member with disability: 1.5%
- Household with no member with disability: 2.5%
- Household location - urban: 2.1%
- Household location - camp: 3.7%
- Aid recipient household: 2.6%
- Non-aid recipient household: 1.5%

Protection against sexual exploitation and abuse

% of households reporting that any member of their household was aware of the aid worker’s code of conduct:

- Female-headed households: 10.0%
- Male-headed households: 10.5%
- Refugee households: 12.2%
- Non-refugee households: 7.2%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 9.3%
- Head of household (60+): 14.8%

% of households reporting that any member of their household was contacted on their preferred ways to report sensitive information by household population group:

- Female-headed households: 3.8%
- Male-headed households: 2.2%
- Refugee households: 2.4%
- Non-refugee households: 2.2%
- Head of household age (18 - 59): 2.1%
- Head of household (60 and older): 2.8%
- Household with member with disability: 1.5%
- Household with no member with disability: 2.5%
- Household location - urban: 2.1%
- Household location - camp: 3.7%
- Aid recipient household: 2.6%
- Non-aid recipient household: 1.5%

All questions related to CRM were asked only to aid-recipient households.

The term sensitive information here can be defined as including, but not limited to, misconduct of aid workers, abuse, harassment, disrespect, sexual harassment, fraud, or any kind of dissatisfaction with the way in which aid was delivered etc.
Annex 1: Indicator Mapping

TABLE OF MAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Map Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Map of MSNA coverage by governorate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>% of households considered in need based on difficulties experienced when trying to access healthcare services, by governorate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>% of household relying on unimproved water sources for drinking water, by governorate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>% of households with any reported shelter damage, defects, or issues by governorate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>% households reporting a need for catch-up learning due to school closures, by governorate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>% of households reporting that at least one household member showed signs of psychosocial distress or trauma in the past year, by governorate and severity score</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those indicators (Health and Protection) were severity scoring was used in mapping, the scoring has been presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health % of households that can access primary healthcare within one hour by regular mode of transport</td>
<td>HH MSNA Less than 30 minutes AND no access barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 30 minutes AND no access barriers</td>
<td>Less than 30 minutes AND facing access barriers</td>
<td>More than 30 minutes AND facing access barriers</td>
<td>No criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health % of households facing barriers when trying to access health services</td>
<td>HH MSNA % of households with NO member of the household self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of households with 1% to 30% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td>% of households with 31% to 60% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td>% of households with 61% to 100% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection % of households were at least one member of the household is self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress or trauma</td>
<td>HH MSNA % of households with NO member of the household self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td></td>
<td>No criteria</td>
<td>% of households with 1% to 30% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td>% of households with 31% to 60% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td>% of households with 61% to 100% of their household members self-reporting signs of psychosocial distress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2: Assessing disability

Disability in the MSNA was assessed through the Washington Group Questions, which assess functional limitations for each individual member of the household for each of the following functions: communicating, hearing, remembering, seeing, self-care and personal hygiene, and walking. Due to the survey design and limitations of the MSNA, the Washington Group Questions were asked by proxy to the respondent for each individual household member over the age of 5 years. Some answer choices provided may therefore reflect more accurately the subjective perception of the respondent rather than the experiences of all individual members of the household with a disability.

Indicators related to disability inclusion were included as cross-cutting indicators throughout all sectoral sections of the MSNA survey.
## Annex 3: Gaza Sample Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata Gaza</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abasan al Jadida</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abasan al Kabira</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bureij</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Bureij Camp</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Fukhari</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maghazi</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Maghazi Camp</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mughraqa</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Musaddar</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Qarara</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Shokat</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Naser</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Nuseirat</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Nuseirat Camp</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Shati' Camp</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Az Zawayda</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bani Suheila</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beit Hanoun</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beit Lahiya</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir al Balah</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir al Balah Camp</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabalya</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabalya Camp</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhor ad Dik (Wadi Gaza)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Yunis Camp</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuza’a</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madinat Ezahra</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah Camp</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm an Naser</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi as Salga</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT CONDUCTED IN THE FRAMEWORK OF:

About REACH:
REACH Initiative facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity 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, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT).