MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS

Idleb governorate and the surrounding opposition-held areas of western Aleppo and north-western Hama governorates host one of the largest IDP populations in Syria. Since late 2017, following an escalation of violence in north-western and southern Syria, the region has witnessed the further arrival of a substantial number of IDPs. Large cross-line displacements from Eastern Ghouta, northern Homs and southern Hama, beginning in March 2018, have led to a significant increase of the IDP population in the region. While humanitarian assistance is reaching both camps and out-of-camp communities, major gaps remain. In order to address such gaps, REACH has conducted a needs assessment to inform humanitarian actors of IDPs’ needs and to address critical information gaps on the humanitarian conditions of IDPs in host communities in the region. This situation overview provides an outline of findings from this assessment.

MAIN FINDINGS

- An estimated 1,207,295 IDPs were reported to reside in the 255 assessed communities of Idleb, Aleppo and Hama governorates at the time of data collection. On average, IDPs represented 36% of the total population (3,331,836) in assessed communities. With 377,918 IDPs, Dana sub-district accounted for 31% of the total reported IDP population.
- 68% of all IDPs reportedly arrived to their current location more than six months ago. The majority of IDPs were reported to originate from other communities in Hama (22%), Aleppo (21%) and Idleb (16%) governorates.
- An estimated 210 thousand IDPs (17%) were reportedly living in overcrowded shelters at the time of data collection. Almost half of these (46%) were in Dana, Idleb, Atarib and Salqin sub-districts.
- Key Informants (KIs) in 69% of assessed communities reported that IDPs faced a general lack of employment opportunities as a barrier to accessing livelihoods. The most commonly reported push and pull factors for IDPs expected to leave their current location in the month following data collection were loss of income (56%) in their current host communities and job opportunities (66%) elsewhere.
- Assistance from NGOs was reported as one of the most common sources of food for IDPs in 56% of assessed communities. In 78% of assessed communities, IDPs were reportedly using negative coping strategies for lack of food, including selling productive assets and skipping meals.
- KIs in 176 (69%) assessed communities reported that health facilities and services accessible to IDPs were affected by a lack of medicines and medical items. Furthermore, 24% of assessed communities reportedly had no permanent health facilities in the community available to IDPs.
- In 134 (54%) assessed communities, IDPs reportedly had no access to a functioning main water network in the month prior to data collection. The most commonly reported source of drinking water for IDPs was water trucking, reported in 65% of assessed communities. In 55% of assessed communities, IDPs were reportedly modifying hygiene practices to cope with a lack of water.
- Despite the availability of formal schools in the majority of assessed communities, the estimated 330 thousand school-aged IDPs reportedly faced many barriers to accessing education. In 53% of assessed communities it was reported that some IDP parents could not afford to send their children to school.
- In 168 assessed communities, IDPs were reported to have, on average, less than 4 hours of electricity per day. In 75% of communities, generators were the most common sources of electricity used by IDPs.
- IDPs were reportedly to be affected by a range of protection risks. While KIs in almost a third of assessed communities reported that IDPs faced a threat of air strikes in the month prior to data collection, either travelling to or after arriving to their current location, KIs in 60% of assessed communities reported that some IDP children (aged 0 to 17 years) in the community were working.

METHODOLOGY

Findings presented in this situation overview are based on data collected by REACH as part of a needs assessment focused on IDPs living in host communities of Idleb governorate and surrounding areas. Data was collected in 255 communities across 28 sub-districts between 24 and 31 May 2018. Data was collected at the community level, with enumerators interviewing between 1 and 5 key informants (KIs) per community and with KIs selected based on their knowledge of IDPs in the community and sector-specific expertise. Communities were assessed based on available data on populations and displacement, focusing on those reported to host a high number of IDPs and those that have received a high number of IDP arrivals in the two months prior to the start of data collection. Collected primary data was further triangulated through available secondary data sources. Information should only be considered as relevant to the time of data collection, given the dynamic situation in the region. Findings are not statistically representative and should be considered as indicative only, particularly as they are aggregated across locations between which the sectoral situation may vary. The full rapid needs assessment data set can be found here.
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**KEY EVENTS**

Despite the declaration of Idleb governorate and surrounding areas as a “de-escalation zone” for a period of six months after September 2017, the region has experienced a significant escalation of conflict since November 2017. Violent clashes between opposition groups and Government of Syria (GoS) forces intensified in the south-east of Idleb governorate (in particular in Abul Thohur, Sanjar, Saraqab and Tamanah sub-districts) and in western Aleppo and north-eastern Hama governorates and continued until early February 2018. This led to a large wave of displacements from numerous communities near conflict lines in the south-west of the region. Furthermore, continued air strikes on areas in Idleb governorate far from frontlines, including on communities in Idleb, Ma’arrat An Nu’man and other sub-districts in southern and central Idleb governorate, led to a significant number of displacements, with many people reportedly being displaced multiple times. As Idleb governorate had witnessed the arrival of a large number of IDPs from northern Hama and western Aleppo governorates in previous months, already over-burdened camps, informal settlements, and host communities had to accommodate a large number of new IDP arrivals in a short amount of time.

- GoS forces advance into southern Idleb, escalating conflict in the governorate.
- More than 100,000 displaced by offensive in southern Idleb.
- Areas in southern Idleb become inaccessible to humanitarian actors due to ongoing hostilities.

Between the second half of March and the first half of April, intensification of conflict in Eastern Ghouta, Rural Damascus governorate, culminated in the displacement of tens of thousands of people from the area. While many were reportedly displaced to collective shelters in Rural Damascus, thousands were evacuated to opposition-held areas in the north-west of the country. The most recent wave of arrivals to north-west Syria began with evacuations from Al-Qadam neighbourhood in Damascus between 14 and 15 March and continued with subsequent evacuations from Harasta, Arbin and Duma in Eastern Ghouta between 23 March and 8 April. The escalation of clashes that followed in remaining opposition-held areas south of Damascus in the Eastern Qalamoun region, and in the Ar-Rastan area in northern Homs and southern Hama governorates, led to further displacements from these areas to north-west Syria. In total, approximately 100,000-110,000 arrivals were reported from these areas to north-west Syria between mid March and late May. Many of these IDPs arrived to communities in Idleb governorate and surrounding areas, thus further increasing the burden on many host communities in the region.

- Thousands of IDPs return to their communities of origin in south-east Idleb.
- Limited response capacity to provide assistance in Idleb is stretched further as large cross-line displacements take place from Eastern Ghouta.
- Thousands more arrive from areas south of Damascus city, from eastern Qalamoun, and from northern Homs and southern Hama governorates.

**Areas of influence and recent major displacements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Influence</th>
<th>Mid December 2017</th>
<th>Early-mid January 2018</th>
<th>Early-mid January 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government of Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Branch/ Euphrates Shield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Federation of Northern Syria - Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sourced from Live UA Map 31 May 2018**

- Assessed Community
- Border Crossing Closed
- Border Crossing Open
- Border Crossing Sporadically Open or Restricted

**Major displacements into opposition-held Idleb Region November 2017- May 2018**

- Nov - Feb
- March - April
- May
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DEMOGRAPHICS

Idleb governorate and surrounding areas is host to one of the largest IDP populations in Syria. Overall, KIs estimated that 1,207,295 IDPs resided in the 255 assessed communities at the time of data collection, accounting for approximately 36% of the total population of 3,331,836 individuals. IDPs in communities that were assessed for this situation overview therefore represent a majority of the approximately 1.3-1.4 million IDPs living in the entire region.20

IDLEB

Sub-districts with the largest number of IDPs in assessed communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-district</th>
<th>Number of IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>377,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atareb</td>
<td>104,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salqin</td>
<td>86,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idleb</td>
<td>72,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma`arrat An Nu’man</td>
<td>67,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Dana sub-district had the highest total number of IDPs, Janudiyeh sub-district had the highest proportion of IDPs among its total population (63%) in assessed communities.

Distribution of IDPs in assessed communities by gender and age:

- More than half (56%) of all IDPs in assessed communities were younger than 18 years old.
- 59% of IDPs in assessed communities were reportedly women or girls.

Proportion of assessed communities reporting three most common IDP profiles:

- Male-headed households: 99%
- Female-headed households: 80%
- Elderly: 57%

Most common governorate of origin of IDPs in assessed communities (% IDPs):

- Hama: 22%
- Aleppo: 21%
- Idleb: 16%
- Homs: 5%
- Deir-ez-Zor: 4%
- Rural Damascus: 4%
- Other/unknown: 28%

Almost two thirds of IDPs reported originated from other communities in Aleppo, Hama and Idleb governorates. Recent arrivals from Rural Damascus represented 4% of the total IDP population in assessed communities.

Distribution of IDPs by duration of stay in current host community:

- Less than 2 months: 9%
- 2-6 months: 23%
- More than 6 months: 68%

More than two thirds of the IDP population had reportedly been living in their current location for more than six months.

While only 9% of IDPs arrived to current locations in the two months prior to data collection, new arrivals nonetheless represented more than 100,000 IDPs.

Reported IDP populations in assessed communities at the time of data collection:

- 1,207,295: Estimated number of IDPs in assessed communities.
- 2,214,541: Estimated number of residents in assessed communities.

Proportion of IDPs in total population:

- 66-80%
- 46-65%
- 26-45%
- 0-25%

Proportion of IDPs in host community:

- IDPs: 64%
- Host community: 36%

Most common governorate of origin of IDPs in assessed communities (% IDPs):

- Hama: 22%
- Aleppo: 21%
- Idleb: 16%
- Homs: 5%
- Deir-ez-Zor: 4%
- Rural Damascus: 4%
- Other/unknown: 28%

Almost two thirds of IDPs reported originated from other communities in Aleppo, Hama and Idleb governorates. Recent arrivals from Rural Damascus represented 4% of the total IDP population in assessed communities.
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**SHELTER**

An estimated 210 thousand IDPs (17%) in assessed communities of Idleb governorate and surrounding areas were reported to be living in overcrowded shelters at the time of data collection. The most commonly reported shelter types of IDPs were solid/finished houses (32%), managed camps (21%) and solid/finished apartments (18%). Many IDPs were reportedly residing in vulnerable shelter conditions, with 94% of assessed communities reporting inadequacies in some current IDP shelters. Over half of all assessed communities reported that IDPs were in need of doors/window frames. Meanwhile, only 15 of the 255 assessed communities reported that no shelter maintenance or repairs were needed.

**210 thousand**

Estimated number of IDPs living in overcrowded shelters.

**124,066**

Estimated number of IDPs living in unfinished/damaged buildings.

Reported shelter sufficiency for IDPs in assessed communities:

- 100,001-260,000: 3
- 47,001-100,000: 92
- 15,001-47,000: 2
- 4,001-15,000: 14
- Less than or equal to 4,000: 1

Most commonly reported shelter types of IDPs in assessed communities:

- Solid/finished house: 32%
- Managed camp: 21%
- Solid/finished apartment: 18%
- Unfinished/damaged building: 10%
- Individual tent: 5%
- Other/unknown: 14%

An estimated 250 thousand IDPs were reportedly living in vulnerable shelter types in assessed communities, including unfinished/damaged buildings, individual tents and informal settlements.

Sub-districts with the largest number of IDPs living in overcrowded shelters:

- Dana: 39,184
- Idleb: 26,542
- Atareb: 18,616
- Salqin: 15,245
- Kafr Nobol: 12,183

Almost half (48%) of IDPs living in overcrowded shelters were in Dana, Idleb, Atareb and Salqin sub-districts. All of these have witnessed high IDP arrivals from other areas in recent months.

Proportion of assessed communities reporting most common IDP shelter issues:

- Insufficient number of shelters: 62%
- Shelters are too small: 52%
- Lack of privacy: 42%
- Leaking during rain: 39%
- Shelters are heavily damaged/unusable: 35%
- No issues: 6%

Most commonly reported shelter needs of IDPs in assessed communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter need</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Doors/window frames</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Windows/window frames</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tarpalins/plastic sheeting</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New/additional tents</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Basic electrical items</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plaster/material for wall repairs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Roofing materials</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bricks or other stone blocks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Concrete</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Timber</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.
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**FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOODS**

IDPs in Idlib governorate and surrounding areas reportedly faced various challenges in accessing livelihoods and meeting their basic food needs. In the majority of assessed communities, KIs reported that IDPs rely on sources such as food aid and borrowing, and resort to negative coping strategies, including reducing meal sizes, selling productive assets, and spending days without food. In addition, many staple food sources were reported to be either unavailable or unaffordable for IDPs in several communities, with food markets available to IDPs reportedly not functioning entirely or at certain times in 42 assessed communities.

Coping strategies reported for lack of food:
- 78% with food assistance
- 22% with no food assistance

Total IDP population of a community in which no food assistance was reported:
- 230
- 5,000
- 10,000
- 14,000

**Top 3 reported IDP coping mechanisms for lack of food:**
1. Foregoing other goods (46%)
2. Selling non-productive assets (40%)
3. Borrowing/buying food on credit (38%)

Reported food assistance for IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:

Most commonly reported sources of livelihoods for IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- Waged labour: 86%
- Petty labour: 56%
- Food aid: 38%
- Livestock products: 29%
- Loans/remittances/food gifts from relatives: 21%

Most commonly reported barriers to accessing livelihoods faced by IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- Lack of job opportunities to match IDPs’ skills: 72%
- General lack of employment opportunities: 69%
- Lack of access to resources needed for jobs: 24%
- Security situation in the community: 13%
- Discrimination in job provision: 12%

Most commonly reported sources of food for IDPs in assessed communities:
- Purchasing from stores/markets: 93%
- Assistance from NGOs: 56%
- Assistance from local councils: 35%
- Borrowing: 22%
- Relying entirely on personal food stocks: 11%

Most commonly reported barriers to accessing food markets faced by IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- Safety/security constraints at markets: 40%
- Markets do not function at times of conflict: 26%
- Safety/security constraints travelling to markets: 23%
- Lack of access for persons with restricted mobility: 9%
- Distance to markets too far: 8%

The top five reported food needs of IDPs (by proportion of communities reporting them) were meat (31%), flour (29%), sugar (22%), cooking oil (18%) and chicken (18%).

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.
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**HEALTH**

Conflict and displacement have put considerable strain on health facilities in north-west Syria. While almost a quarter of assessed communities were reported to lack basic health facilities at the time of data collection, in the vast majority of locations where health facilities and services were available and functioning, IDPs faced several barriers to accessing these. More than two thirds of assessed communities reported that health facilities lacked medicines and medical items, and that treatment for chronic diseases was a current health need for IDP populations.

![Map showing health facilities in Idleb Governorate and surrounding areas.]

**Proportion of assessed communities reporting main healthcare access barriers faced by IDPs in the month prior to data collection:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier to Healthcare</th>
<th>Proportion of Communities Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medicine/medical items</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services not easily accessible</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe to travel to medical facilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but unaffordable</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical personnel</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but of low quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical personnel</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but unaffordable</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but of low quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical personnel</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but unaffordable</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but of low quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical personnel</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but unaffordable</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare available but of low quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most common health needs of IDPs in assessed communities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Service Need</th>
<th># of Communities Reporting</th>
<th>% of Communities Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Treatment for chronic disease</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Surgery</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emergency care (accident and injuries)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Skilled care during childbirth</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Antibiotics</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Injury rehabilitation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assistive devices</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Psychiatric care</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.*

More than half of assessed communities reported that IDPs were in need of treatment for chronic diseases such as diabetes, blood pressure, heart problems and kidney problems, and surgical health services.
WASH

The water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) needs of IDPs in assessed communities of Idleb governorate and surrounding areas were reported to be widespread and severe. In more than half of assessed communities, IDPs reportedly had no access to a functioning main water network in the month prior to data collection. As a result of the limited availability of water sources, IDPs in the majority of assessed communities relied on water trucking as their primary source of drinking water, and were reported to resort to negative coping mechanisms to meet their water requirements. Only 40% of communities reported that all or almost all IDPs had enough water to meet their needs.

Top 3 reported IDP coping mechanisms for lack of water:
1) Modifying hygiene practices (55%)
2) Foregoing other goods (45%)
3) Consuming less drinking water (41%)

Most common sources of drinking water for IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- Water trucking: 65%
- Main network: 20%
- Neighbourhood borehole - paid: 13%
- Neighbourhood borehole - free: 1%
- Drinking water unavailable: 1%

The most common source of drinking water used by IDPs was water trucking, reported in 165 communities.

Average number of days per week during which water from the main network was accessible to IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- 7 days: 7%
- 5-6 days: 3%
- 3-4 days: 7%
- 1-2 days: 28%
- 0 days: 53%

Almost 76% of assessed communities reported lack of water, while 24% reported no lack of water.

Most common sanitation issues faced by IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:
- Garbage in the streets: 53%
- Rats/pests contaminating food and people: 49%
- Sewage flowing onto the streets: 27%
- Open defecation: 10%
- Flooding in the streets: 6%

Almost three quarters of assessed communities (73%) reported at least one sanitation issue faced by IDPs in the month prior to data collection.

Almost 98% of assessed communities reported that the water used by most IDPs was safe to drink. In 5 communities - 4 of which in Darkosh sub-district - KIs reported that water accessible to most IDPs either tasted or smelled bad, or that people got sick after drinking it.

Reported water sufficiency for IDPs in assessed communities:
- Total IDP population: 230
- 140,000
- 92,000
- 45,000
- 230

Most common reasons for inaccessibility of general purpose water for IDPs:
- Alternative sources too expensive: 44%
- Main network dysfunctional due to damage: 27%
- Main network dysfunctional due to disrepair: 24%
- Alternative sources unavailable: 10%
- Boreholes dysfunctional due to damage: 6%

Almost 40% of assessed communities reported that the water used by most IDPs was safe to drink. In 5 communities - 4 of which in Darkosh sub-district - KIs reported that water accessible to most IDPs either tasted or smelled bad, or that people got sick after drinking it.

Coping strategies reported for lack of water:
- 76% reported lack of water
- 24% reported no lack of water

Top 3 coping strategies reported:
1) Modifying hygiene practices (55%)
2) Foregoing other goods (45%)
3) Consuming less drinking water (41%)

Proportion of assessed communities reporting that IDPs have enough water for their needs:
- All or almost all IDPs: 40%
- More than half of IDPs: 35%
- Half of IDPs: 12%
- Less than half of IDPs: 10%
- Few or no IDPs: 4%

Sanitation issue | # | %
---|---|---
1. Garbage in the streets | 136 | 53%
2. Rats/pests contaminating food and people | 126 | 49%
3. Sewage flowing onto the streets | 70 | 27%
4. Open defecation | 25 | 10%
5. Flooding in the streets | 17 | 7%

Almost 40% of assessed communities reported that the water used by most IDPs was safe to drink. In 5 communities - 4 of which in Darkosh sub-district - KIs reported that water accessible to most IDPs either tasted or smelled bad, or that people got sick after drinking it.

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.
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**EDUCATION**

With an estimated **330 thousand IDPs of school age** at the time of data collection, and a further 270 thousand IDPs between the ages of 0 and 5, education needs in the region were reported to be widespread and likely to increase. Despite the availability of formal schools in the majority of assessed communities, IDP children faced a number of barriers to accessing education - most commonly, the need for boys and girls to work or stay at home to support their families. Female IDPs also faced particular challenges, with education facilities reportedly unavailable to girls in 13 communities. Meanwhile, insufficient teaching and learning resources were reported in almost three quarters of assessed communities.

**Gender-disaggregated primary and secondary school attendance rate among IDPs in assessed communities (by proportion of communities reporting):**

![Graph showing primary and secondary school attendance rate among IDPs in assessed communities](image)

**Proportion of assessed communities reporting that IDP parents cannot afford to send children to school:**

- 53%

**Reported primary school attendance rate among IDPs in assessed communities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total IDP population</th>
<th>230</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education facilities available to IDPs in assessed communities:**

- Formal schools: 97%
- Mosques/other buildings: 18%
- Informal learning centres: 17%
- Homes: 7%

Only 1 assessed community (Mozra, in Ehsem sub-district) reported that no schools were available for IDPs in the community.

**Most commonly reported barriers to accessing education faced by IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:**

- Families need boys to work/support at home: 83%
- Families need girls to work/support at home: 69%
- Parents cannot afford to send children to school: 53%
- Travel to schools unsafe due to security situation: 12%
- Distance to schools too long: 7%

93% of assessed communities reported that IDP children faced at least one barrier to accessing education in the month prior to data collection.

**Most commonly reported issues with education facilities/services available to IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education issue</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Too few teaching/learning supplies</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Too few qualified teachers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unsuitable learning environment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low quality of education</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Damaged facilities</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of recognised certification</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overcrowding</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local authorities closing schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.
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**NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFIs) & ELECTRICITY**

The need for NFIs, fuel and electricity sources among IDP populations in Idleb governorate and surrounding areas was found to be high at the time of data collection. Due to the absence of electricity through official networks in the region, a majority of assessed communities reported that IDPs had on average less than 4 hours of electricity per day. Several of the main sources of fuel for cooking and other NFIs were reportedly available in markets in almost all communities in the month prior to data collection. However, many of these items were reported to be unaffordable for IDPs at their current prices.

- **Reported access to electricity among IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:**
  - 168 communities reported that IDPs had, on average, less than 4 hours of electricity per day.
  - 68% of assessed communities reported that IDPs required solar panels.

- **Average number of hours of access to electricity per day for IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:**
  - More than 8 hours
  - 6-8 hours
  - 4-6 hours
  - 2-4 hours
  - 0-2 hours
  - 0 hours
  - 3% 2% 29% 48% 6% 12%

- **Most commonly reported barriers to accessing electricity faced by IDPs in assessed communities in the month prior to data collection:**
  - Electricity too expensive
  - Main network dysfunctional due to disrepair
  - Fuel too expensive
  - Main network dysfunctional due to damage
  - Generators unavailable
  - 62% 42% 42% 40% 11%

- **Most commonly reported NFI needs of IDPs in assessed communities:**
  - Solar panels
  - Water containers
  - Batteries
  - Cooking fuel
  - Mattresses/sleeping mats
  - Disposable diapers
  - Clothing
  - Cooking utensils
  - Light sources/solar lamps
  - Cooking stoves
  - Bedding items
  - Shoes
  - Washing powder (for clothes)
  - Detergent (for dishes)
  - Soap
  - Sanitary pads
  - 68% 56% 55% 52% 41% 37% 31% 27% 23% 21% 10% 8% 5% 4%

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.
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**PROTECTION & INTENTIONS**

IDPs in Idleb governorate and surrounding areas were reported to face a range of protection risks, with almost two thirds of assessed communities reporting that recent IDP arrivals faced risks such as shelling, air strikes, sniper fire/gunfire, and landmines while travelling to their present locations. In addition, IDPs were reported to face various safety and security issues in their current communities. Despite this, the limited options available to IDPs meant that KIs in the majority (74%) of assessed communities expected less than a quarter of their IDP populations to leave within the month following data collection. Possible factors such as an initiation or escalation of aerial bombardments and ground incursions were reported to likely increase the number of people being displaced.

- **60%** Proportion of assessed communities reporting that some IDP children were working.
- **74%** Proportion of assessed communities expecting the large majority of their IDP populations not to leave in the month following data collection.

**Most commonly reported intended destinations of IDPs expected to leave assessed communities in the month following data collection:**

- Host communities in the same governorate: 33%
- Camps in the same governorate: 29%
- Outside of Syria: 18%
- Host communities in other governorates: 2%
- Other/unknown: 18%

**Most common push factors from current locations for IDPs expected to leave assessed communities in the month following data collection:**

- Loss of income: 56%
- High cost of living: 41%
- Reduced access to food: 37%
- Escalation of conflict: 27%
- Loss of assets: 21%

**Most common pull factors to intended destinations for IDPs expected to leave assessed communities in the month following data collection:**

- Job opportunities: 66%
- Humanitarian assistance: 40%
- Relative safety/security: 38%
- Family/community ties: 20%
- Return to area of origin: 20%

**Most commonly reported reasons for IDPs expected to remain in assessed communities:**

- Family ties/host community relationship: 53%
- Safety/security situation in the community: 39%
- Access to income and employment opportunities: 38%
- Protect assets: 31%
- Lack of money to pay for movement: 28%

The most commonly reported possible events that could lead to an increase in IDP departures in the month following data collection were the start of aerial bombardment (77%), start of ground incursions (47%), inaccessibility of food (28%), and opening of safe passages to other locations (26%).

*Number and percentage of communities reporting.*
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