

James Madison University

JMU Scholarly Commons

Global CWD Repository

Center for International Stabilization and
Recovery

2014

Bombs Under the Rubble: Study of Awareness of Explosive Remnants of War Among the Population of Gaza

HI

Humanity and Inclusion

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd>



Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

HI, "Bombs Under the Rubble: Study of Awareness of Explosive Remnants of War Among the Population of Gaza" (2014). *Global CWD Repository*. 1519.

<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd/1519>

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global CWD Repository by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.



© Handicap International / Nick Boedicker

BOMBS UNDER THE RUBBLE

STUDY OF AWARENESS
OF EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR
AMONG THE POPULATION OF GAZA

**HANDICAP
INTERNATIONAL**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	p.3
Project Background.....	p.5
Human Impact.....	p.6
Methodology.....	p.7
Sampling.....	p.7
Focus Group Discussions.....	p.9
Data Collection.....	p.9
Ethics and Consent.....	p.10
Strengths and Limitations.....	p.10
Results.....	p.11
Demographic Overview.....	p.11
Knowledge	p.14
Attitudes	p.17
Practices	p.21
Risk Education	p.25
Impact and Support	p.27
Qualitative Data	p.29
Key Findings	p.30
High-risk Profiles	p.30
Boys	p.30
Internally-Displaced Persons.....	p.31
Persons with disabilities	p.33
Recommendations	p.33

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BAC	Battle Area Clearance
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
ERW	Explosive Remnants of War
HI	Handicap International
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices
LIS	Landmine Impact Survey
MPWH	Ministry of Public Works and Housing
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
QA	Quality Assurance
RE	Risk Education
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Services
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

Executive Summary

This baseline assessment was undertaken by Handicap International in October 2014 in all five governorates of Gaza. The focus of the survey was to collect baseline data related to the knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) contamination in communities impacted by the recent conflict.

The survey consisted of two parts: quantitative data collection comprising 459 individual questionnaires and qualitative data collection of 4 focus groups. The questionnaire targeted men, women, and children over 10 years old, while the focus groups targeted adults with disabilities, children, and adolescents. Quotas based on the age and gender in the five governorates sought to represent a proportionate cross-section of the population in impacted communities.

The survey showed that 45% of the overall population surveyed had received Risk Education (RE) messages in the past, with a lesser proportion of respondents in the governorates of North Gaza and Middle Area. The most common means of receiving the RE messages were through a school teacher, television, leaflets, radio, NGO worker, and posters.

Despite high levels of education in the population surveyed, significant gaps remain in knowledge of ERW. When asked which groups in these communities need more RE, the common response was young boys and girls. Regarding attitudes, most respondents are worried about ERW contamination and believe ERW should be reported to authorities.

Overall, about half of respondents had seen ERW during or after the recent conflict. Gender was a key factor

in this; males were much more likely to have reported seeing ERW than females. Of those that had seen ERW, 5% of respondents admitted to tampering with the ERW. Although 70% of the population were able to give the correct answer about how to report ERW (by dialing 100), only 29% of those that had seen ERW had actually reported it. Of those who had entered an area suspected to have ERW (28%), the most common reasons mentioned for doing so were curiosity, returning to collect items from a home that was damaged, farming, and visiting friends and family.

This baseline assessment shows the continued prevalence of high-risk attitudes and practices in Gaza, demonstrating a need for additional campaigns that deliver safety messages to the entire population. This report also highlights issues that could be improved and makes the following recommendations:

- Ensure that resources are allocated to make RE a priority for children.
- Designate the entire frontline of rubble removal and reconstruction as a target for RE and other support.
- Prioritize RE to high-risk governorates.
- Increase cooperation among RE actors and standardize RE messages, monitoring, and evaluation.
- Develop more inclusive Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials and RE activities.
- Integrate RE across humanitarian and development interventions (with a focus on protection and health sectors).
- Ensure continued support is provided to clearance and victim assistance efforts.

Implementing Agency



Created in 1982, Handicap International (HI) is an independent and impartial international aid organization working in situations of poverty and exclusion, conflict and disaster. Working alongside people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, our actions and witness-bearing are focused on responding to their essential needs, improving their living conditions and promoting respect for their dignity and their fundamental rights. HI was co-winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its role in the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and a winner of the Hilton humanitarian prize 2011 based on HI projects in Kenya. In 1999, the organization obtained special consultative status with the United Nations (ECOSOC).

With regards to Mine Action and Armed Violence Reduction & Prevention (AVRP), HI has implemented since 1988 numerous conventional weapons risk reduction interventions to protect civilian populations and prevent injury, impairment and loss of life. Those include i.e. demining, clearance, obsolete weapons and ammunition destruction, risk awareness, risk management in link with Development, conflict transformation, marking and mapping of dangerous areas, technical and non-technical surveys, impact assessments and various surveys.

Today, HI is working in emergency, rehabilitation, reconstruction and development settings in more than 60 countries, in North, Central and East Asia, South and South-East Asia, Indian Ocean, Africa, North Africa and Middle-East, Central and South America.

HI has been present in the Middle East since 1987 and currently operates in Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, and Palestine, with a regional programme office based in Amman, Jordan and field offices in each country. Since the HI programme in Palestine began in 1996 (with the Palestine Priority Programme), we have worked among others on strengthening psychiatric services, a directory of services for persons with disabilities, homecare for people with disabilities, and civil society strengthening. In the 2009 crisis, we provided Disability and Vulnerability Focal Point services. Since 2010, HI has been working extensively with rehabilitation service providers in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, on the quality of services, as well as their availability and accessibility, and on developing the basis for effective referral mechanisms. HI has also been very active these last years in supporting and reinforcing the disability movement for representation and active advocacy for rights.

Funding Agency



The Department for International Development (DFID) leads the UK's work to end extreme poverty. This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK Government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government's official policies.

Project Background

As a result of the fifty days of conflict known as Operation Protective Edge (July 7-August 26, 2014), at least 1,483 Palestinian civilians were killed and over 11,100 Palestinians were injured. In addition, an enormous amount of infrastructure was destroyed or damaged, including over 18,000 housing units, 17 of Gaza's 32 hospitals, 45 of its 97 primary health clinics, 140 schools, and 548 businesses and workshops. Approximately 60,000 internally-displaced persons (IDPs) remain in collection centers following the conflict.

During the conflict, the Israeli Defense Forces used significant amounts of munitions in Gaza in the form of airstrikes, naval projectiles, and land projectiles. In addition, armed groups in Gaza fired rockets and mortars toward Israel, some of which fell short and landed within Gaza. Given the 10% failure rate of these munitions estimated by the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), there are approximately 7,000 items of explosive remnants of war (ERW) remaining, much of which may be buried under rubble.

ERW clearance is undertaken solely by the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) police, a section of the Ministry of Interior in Gaza at this time. The EOD police have one team working in each of the five governorates but face significant challenges including a lack of resources for

salaries, vehicles, fuel, and equipment. Due to the EOD police's connection to the operating government, outside groups are largely unable to provide support to them directly. Related political issues are also preventing international organizations from helping out independently with the clearance effort.

Despite these challenges, UNMAS reports that almost 50 tons of ERW have been removed and destroyed since the end of the conflict. The remaining unexploded ordnance, however, continues to contaminate large areas of Gaza in every governorate, posing a threat to the civilian population, and endangering the rubble removal and reconstruction processes as well as the use of agricultural land.

A damage assessment survey undertaken by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in cooperation with the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (MPWH) showed approximately 11,000 houses severely damaged and 9,000 houses heavily damaged due to the conflict. The rubble removal prioritization process will be based on this damage assessment survey and completed by UNRWA and UNDP in cooperation with the MPWH. The approximately 11,000 severely damaged buildings (public and private) will all be given the option to have UNDP handle the rubble removal on their property. UNMAS will play a supporting role in the process through risk assessment and ERW awareness training for UNDP and MPWH staff as well as the contractors working with them.

UNDP estimates the 50% of the rubble removal after the 2012 conflict was done privately (without assistance from UNDP) and that a higher percentage will be done privately this time due to the greater scale of damage. According to the MPWH, there is four times as much rubble after this conflict than in 2012 (approximately 2.5 million tons compared to 665,000 tons).

It is speculated that the demand for private rubble removal versus UNDP-assisted rubble removal is related to the market price of rubble, which is recycled and used as a building material. If landowners choose to become a part of the UNDP rubble removal process, they forfeit the economic value of that rubble. The price of rubble is related to the availability of other building materials (such as cement) allowed to enter Gaza.

Estimated ordnance used during 2014 conflict

From Gaza toward Israel

1,676 mortar bombs

4,584 rockets

From Israel toward Gaza

5,085 airstrikes

8,210 bombs and missiles dropped/launched

15,736 naval projectiles

36,718 land projectiles

Estimated total ordnance used

72,009 items of ordnance

Estimated 10% failure rate

7,000 items of ERW remaining


Source: UNMAS Presentation, September 24, 2014

Human impact

During the past five years, 158 injuries and 29 deaths attributed to ERW have been recorded in Gaza (source: UNMAS). Casualties from 2009-2014 are summarized in the table beside. As the data shows, boys and men continue to be the most likely to be injured or killed in an accident involving ERW.

Since the ceasefire at the end of August through November 12, 2014, there have been a total of 33 victims attributed to ERW (10 killed and 23 injured). Eighty-five percent of these victims since the ceasefire have been men above the age of 18. The remaining 15% have been boys under the age of 18.

ERW Casualty Statistics (2009-2014)



ERW Casualty Statistics (2009-2014)								
Year	Injured				Killed			
	Men	Boys	Women	Girls	Men	Boys	Women	Girls
2009	20	8	2	0	4	4	0	1
2010	5	8	1	0	0	2	0	0
2011	7	16	0	1	1	2	0	0
2012	9	16	3	3	2	1	0	0
2013	4	16	0	4	0	2	0	0
2014	23	12	0	0	9	1	0	0
Total	68	76	6	8	16	12	0	1

Methodology

This survey relied heavily on components of the Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) framework, a study method developed by the World Health Organization in the 1980s. The primary objectives of a KAP survey are to assess the:

1. Knowledge of the people regarding ERW and risk;
2. Attitudes of the people towards ERW and risk (what leads to risk-taking behaviors);
3. Practices of the people regarding ERW (what are the current behaviors regarding ERW contamination)

Mostly quantitative data was collected, to facilitate the measurement and comparison with future surveys. Quantitative data was collected through closed-ended questions. Qualitative data was also collected through focus groups and interviews with vulnerable populations and those involved in ERW and RE activities in the five governorates.

Two main survey tools were used to collect the data for this baseline assessment:

1. The Baseline Questionnaire (see Appendices A and B) was designed to allow researchers to collect data on the current knowledge, attitudes and practices towards ERW contamination from individuals living in communities that were impacted by bombing during the recent conflict.
2. The Focus Group Discussion Guide (see Appendix C) was designed to stimulate discussion among specific at-risk groups to allow the researchers to collect information on socio-economic and cultural factors that contribute to risk-taking behaviors in different target groups and on the effectiveness of various channels with which to disseminate RE messages to different target groups.

In addition to the survey tools mentioned above, key informant interviews were conducted with organizations involved in ERW or RE activities, including: UNMAS, UNRWA, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Association of International Development Agencies (AIDA), and the Gaza

NGO Safety Office (GANSO).

Sampling

For this survey, non-probability sampling was used due to the lack of secure statistics in each governorate. Specifically, this survey employed cluster and quota sampling in order to ensure that data was collected efficiently from the communities most affected by ERW contamination. Cluster sampling was used to choose which affected neighborhoods would be surveyed. Quota sampling, the non-probability equivalent of stratified sampling, was used to select respondents. Like stratified sampling, the researcher first identified strata and their proportions as they are represented in the population. Then, the required number of subjects from each stratum was selected using a non-random sampling method. To reduce potential bias from a non-random sample, systematic sampling of households was employed.

The survey was undertaken in all five of the governorates of Gaza: North Gaza, Gaza, Middle Area, Khan Yunis, and Rafah. The key data that was used to determine which communities were to be surveyed came from two sources: the Gaza Crisis Atlas and the Gaza Emergency Humanitarian Snapshot, both published by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in August 2014. The five governorates were given a score based on number of fatalities, population, and number of damaged or destroyed buildings. This score was used to produce a proportional survey quota for each governorate, with more surveys being conducted in governorates with a higher impact rating. This was a means of oversampling areas with greater diversity due to high violence or larger populations. The weighting system used was as follows:

Fatality Weight (persons)	Population Weight (persons)	Damage Weight (buildings)
1= 1-99	1= 1-999,999	1= 1-599
2= 100-199	2= 100,000-199,999	2= 600-1,199
3= 200-299	3= 200,000-299,999	3= 1,200-1,799
4= 300-399	4= 300,000-399,999	4= 1,800-2,399
5= 400-499	5= 400,000-499,999	5= 2,400-2,999
6= 500-599	6= 500,000-599,999	
	7= 600,000-699,999	

Based on the population size of Gaza, a sample size of 450 households was determined. This is sufficient power for a 5% margin of error at the 95% confidence level.

This process resulted in the following governorate quotas:

Governorate	Survey Quota
North Gaza	70
Gaza	120
Middle Area	70
Khan Yunis	120
Rafah	70
Total	450

Next, cluster sampling was used to select neighborhoods to survey. Each neighborhood that had buildings damaged as a result of the recent conflict (as indicated by the Gaza Crisis Atlas) was assigned an impact rating based on its number of damaged or destroyed buildings. Low impact neighborhoods were considered those which had between 1-20 buildings that were damaged or destroyed. Medium impact neighborhoods were considered those which had between 21-99 buildings damaged or destroyed. High impact neighborhoods were considered those which had 100 or more damaged or destroyed buildings.

For the calculated quota of surveys to be completed within each governorate, efforts were made to sample evenly among low, medium, and high impact neighborhoods. This was not possible, however, due to some governorates having only a small number of low- and medium-impacted neighborhoods. The result was a sampling that included 10 low impact, 15 medium impact, and 20 high impact neighborhoods (see Appendix F). Within those categories, the neighborhoods to be surveyed were chosen randomly using a random number generator.

Randomly selecting which individuals to survey proved difficult for this survey as there was not a complete list of households in the governorates, not to mention that many buildings were destroyed and many people were living outside of their homes. Due to this, the survey employed systematic sampling. First, the data collectors were instructed to find a mosque in the neighborhood that they were assigned to survey. While facing the front entrance to the mosque, they were instructed turn to the right and interview someone at the fifth house on the

same side of the road. After that initial survey, they were instructed to keep walking straight on the same side of the road and sample the next fifth house. If they needed to turn due to a dead end or because they would exit the neighborhood, they were instructed to always turn to the right and continue surveying every fifth house. If a

selected house was damaged or destroyed, they were instructed to skip it and continue surveying at the next fifth house.

Enumerators were given a quota tracking tool (Appendix D) that outlined the neighborhoods to survey and the target number of males and females within certain age ranges to target in the random households (see

“Population” section below for more details). They were asked to alternate within any neighborhood to survey one man, then one woman, then one boy, then one girl. They were also instructed not to survey more than one person in any household.

The baseline questionnaire targeted men, women, and children over 10 years old. The sample population was stratified into age groups based on age distribution data from the 2007 Population, Housing and Establishment Census published in 2012 by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics. For simplicity, a 50% ratio between male and females was assumed. Target quotas sought to include a representative cross-section of the population and reduce selection bias. The table below shows the target and actual composition of the survey population:

Baseline Survey Participants		
	Target	Actual
Total Surveys	450	459
Male	225 (50%)	224 (49%)
Female	225 (50%)	235 (51%)
Children (10-14)	92 (20%)	93 (20%)
Teenagers/Young Adults (15-24)	142 (32%)	146 (32%)
Adults (25-39)	116 (26%)	117 (25%)
Older Adults (40-64)	82 (18%)	85 (19%)
Elderly (65+)	18 (4%)	18 (4%)

As shown above, the gender and age quotas stayed extremely close to the population proportions targeted, with a difference of less than 1% in each age group surveyed.

Focus Group Discussions

The focus groups consisted of 31 men, women, and children over 10 years old. The data collectors were requested to set up focus groups of approximately 6-8 individuals, with mixed-gender groups consisting of adults with disabilities (over 18), children (10-14), or adolescents

collected qualitative data on similar topics to the baseline questionnaire, including attitudes and practices regarding ERV and ways to reach target groups.

The number of focus groups completed (4) was less than originally planned due to delays in gaining approval for the project from the government in Gaza. Finding support to access certain populations, such as children, also proved difficult due to jurisdictional issues and an overall cautious approach to avoid further trauma to this population.

Focus Group Participants							
Governorates	Adults (18+)		Adolescents (15-18)		Children (10-14)		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
North Gaza	-	-	-	-	5	6	11
Gaza	3	4	4	3	-	-	14
Khan Yunis	3	3	-	-	-	-	6
Total	6	7	4	3	5	6	31

(15-18). The table below shows the aggregated makeup of the focus groups:

Separate focus group guides were developed for children/adolescents and adults (Appendix C). These focus groups

Data Collection

14 enumerators were hired to administrate the questionnaires. They attended one-day training given by Handicap International. The training included an overview of quantitative and qualitative methods; an in-depth review of the tools and methodologies employed by the project; general

rules for interviewing and interview etiquette including special considerations for interviewing persons with disabilities and children; and ERV awareness training provided by UNMAS.

Data collection took place over the course of seven days, beginning on October 13 and ending on October 21. During the data collection period, Quality Assurance (QA) measures were implemented by HI's Data Collection Supervisor, who directly monitored data collection by rotating among the data collection teams. The enumerators were scored on numerous criteria that included the setting up and conducting of interviews (see Appendix E). Data entry was undertaken concurrently with data collection by HI staff, with QA monitored by HI's Project Manager. The data was then imported into Stata 12.1 software for descriptive analysis.

Ethics and Consent

As part of the training discussed above, data collectors were trained on the ethics of data collection, including specific sections for appropriate behavior when interviewing children and persons with disabilities. Before administering the questionnaire, data collectors were instructed to introduce themselves and the project. Every potential interviewee was read a set statement regarding the length, purpose, and anonymity of the survey and asked to give their consent, which was recorded on each form. In total, 13 people declined to take part in the survey and no data was collected, yielding a low non-response rate of 3%. All data contained in the dataset comes from surveys where oral consent was obtained.

For survey purposes, data collectors were instructed to remain neutral during the survey process and not to give any safety messages before or during the data collection. They were instructed, however, to always give appropriate safety messages at the end of the interview, tailored to the needs of participants identified during the administration of the questionnaire.

Strengths and Limitations

The survey employed the most rigorous sampling methods available while also considering practical restraints regarding time, cost, and the current situation in Gaza. The mixed-methods approach allowed assessment of both trends among the general population and in-depth perspectives from key stakeholders.

Time was a major constraint as this survey sought to produce useful data as quickly as possible for the sector. Time constraints were made worse by delays in the approval of the questionnaire by the post-crisis reality and the particularly specific and sensitive environment of the Gaza Strip.

The instability in Gaza and constant migration resulted in difficulties procuring statistics for each governorate, so non-probability sampling was used for the survey. Although we cannot say for sure that the sample is or is not representative of the population as a whole, stratification (by governorate and age) and systematic sampling (by household) were methods used to increase the representativeness of this data.

The sampling procedures introduce some potential biases. A survey of de facto population will inherently exclude those who have fled, emigrated, or died. As such, the sample population may underrepresent those who have been most affected by the violence. In this survey, for example, it was not possible to get access to the collective centers that housed much of the IDP population due to insecurity.

Furthermore, buildings that would ordinarily house only one family might now contain two or more families, which could skew conclusions. Finally, some populations may be less likely to be included in the survey, either because they are difficult to find during the day or less likely to offer oral consent.

Results

Demographic Overview

This survey was designed to control for gender and age in order to represent a proportionate cross-section of the population in Gaza. The following table shows the breakdown of the population surveyed:


Gender and Age			
	Male	Female	Total
Children (10-14)	47 (10%)	46 (10%)	93 (20%)
Teenagers/Young Adults (15-24)	75 (16%)	71 (15%)	146 (32%)
Adults (25-39)	58 (13%)	59 (13%)	117 (25%)
Older Adults (40-64)	45 (10%)	40 (9%)	85 (19%)
Elderly (65+)	10 (2%)	8 (2%)	18 (4%)
Total	235 (51%)	224 (49%)	459 (100%)

The survey also controlled for location, choosing to survey in low, medium, and high impact communities in the five governorates of Gaza. A breakdown of the percentage of surveys in each of the governorates is below:

have access to different services and service providers, including those that provide RE such as schools. Residency status was roughly equal among genders surveyed.

Surveys Conducted by Governorate


■ Gaza North ■ Gaza ■ Middle Area ■ Khan Yunis ■ Rafah



The survey also collected information on the residency status (refugee or non-refugee) of the population surveyed. Not to be confused with internal displacement resulting from the recent conflict, refugee residency status refers to those refugees that were displaced during the 1948 conflict and their patrilineal descendants. Depending on residency status, members of the population of Gaza


Participants were also asked about the highest level of education they had received, which can be seen in the table below. There are two separate school systems in Gaza* with different grade levels for primary (roughly ages 6-11), preparatory (roughly ages 12-14), and secondary levels (roughly ages 15-18). Education levels were roughly equal among genders surveyed.

Residency Status




During the time of the survey, there were a large number of IDPs present in Gaza. Due to the risk of this group returning to their homes to look for valuables that were left behind among other factors, this group was treated as a suspected vulnerable group for the purpose of analysis. To identify IDPs, the survey asked participants if they were currently living away from their home due to the recent war. If yes, they were also asked where their home was. Results are outlined below:

Education



A second suspected vulnerable group was persons with indicators of disability. The table below shows the percent of male and female participants that replied that they had chronic difficulties with certain activities. These specific indicators of disability were used to align the data with the already-existing assessment forms used by HI. For the purpose of this survey, this group will be treated as “persons with indicators of disability,” not persons with disabilities since the degree of impairment could not be assessed by the data collectors, who were not qualified to diagnose physical or mental/intellectual impairment.

IDP Status and Home Governorate



* For government schools, primary school runs from 1st to 6th grade, preparatory school runs from 7th to 9th grade, and secondary school. In UN schools, primary school runs from 1st to 4th grade, preparatory school runs from 5th to 9th grade, and secondary school runs from 10th to 12th grade.

Persons with Indicators of Disability (Q19)			
Indicators of Disability	Male	Female	Total
Difficulty hearing	9 (2%)	11 (2%)	20 (4%)
Difficulty seeing	11 (2%)	11 (2%)	22 (5%)
Difficulty speaking	3 (1%)	0	3 (1%)
Difficulty moving	10 (2%)	3 (1%)	13 (3%)
Difficulty understanding	11 (2%)	6 (1%)	17 (4%)
Difficulty learning	8 (2%)	1 (0.2%)	9 (2%)
Difficulty managing emotions	8 (2%)	17 (4%)	25 (5%)
Difficulty taking care of self	11 (2%)	1 (0.2%)	12 (3%)
Difficulty interacting with others	1 (0.2%)	0	1 (0.2%)
One or more of the above difficulties	59 (13%)	53 (12%)	112 (24%)
None of these difficulties	176 (38%)	171 (37%)	347 (76%)

Participants who had one or more indicators of disability were also asked if any of the difficulties they mentioned were a result of either shelling/bombing during the recent conflict or an accident with unexploded ordnance during or after the recent conflict. Fifty-six participants said that

the difficulty they mentioned was due to shelling/bombing during the recent conflict. Two participants said that their difficulty was due to an accident with unexploded ordnance during or after the recent conflict.


Knowledge

Knowledge is one of the key components of the KAP Survey, and various questions in the baseline questionnaire tested participants' knowledge of ERW contamination in their communities.

Overall, knowledge of the dangers of ERW was very high, with 99% of respondents providing at least one correct answer when asked what ERW can do to a person (Q6). In order of frequency, the most common answers were: "Kill the person" (90%), "Maim/Cause physical disabilities" (49%), and "Injure the person" (46%). Rates were similar across age, gender, governorate, residency status, and suspected vulnerable groups.

Knowledge regarding how ERW are marked was significantly less in the target population. The table below shows the resulting data:

Q10. Can you tell me how places where there are ERW are marked?




Q10. Can you tell me how places where there are ERW are marked?			
Gender and age	At least one correct answer	Don't know	Total
Male 10-14	28 (60%)	19 (40%)	47
Female 10-14	32 (70%)	14 (30%)	46
Male 15-24	64 (85%)	11 (15%)	75
Female 15-24	62 (87%)	9 (13%)	71
Male 25-39	51 (88%)	7 (12%)	58
Female 25-39	47 (80%)	12 (20%)	59
Male 40-64	33 (75%)	11 (25%)	44
Female 40-64	28 (70%)	12 (30%)	40
Male 65+	9 (90%)	1 (10%)	10
Female 65+	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	8
Total	359 (78%)	99 (22%)	458

In order of frequency, the most indicated ERW markings were "Warning sign" (41%), "Red flag" (20%), "Red and white tape" (19%), "Skull and crossbones" (12%), and "Crossed sticks" (5%). Twenty-two percent of overall respondents answered "Don't know," while 1% gave no response. Rates varied across age, gender, and governorate. Young boys (10-14) were the most likely to answer "Don't know" (40%). Persons with at least one indicator of disability were more likely to answer "Don't know" (35%) compared to those with no indicators of disability (17%). In Gaza Governorate, only 4% of respondents answered

"Don't know" as compared to 39% in North Gaza, 26% in Middle Area, 26% in Khan Yunis, and 23% in Rafah.

Question 11 asked respondents if they knew what could cause an ERW to explode. Ninety percent of respondents could name at least one action that makes an ERW explode, while 8% of the overall population surveyed answered "Don't know," 2% who gave only an incorrect answer, and <1% who gave no response.

Q11. Can you tell me what makes an ERW explode?



Q11. Can you tell me what makes an ERW explode?			
Gender and age	At least one correct answer	Don't know	Total
Male 10-14	40 (85%)	7 (15%)	47
Female 10-14	35 (76%)	11 (24%)	46
Male 15-24	70 (93%)	2 (3%)	75
Female 15-24	62 (87%)	7 (10%)	71
Male 25-39	58 (100%)	0	58
Female 25-39	53 (90%)	5 (8%)	59
Male 40-64	43 (96%)	1 (2%)	45
Female 40-64	36 (90%)	3 (8%)	40
Male 65+	10 (100%)	0	10
Female 65+	7 (88%)	1 (13%)	8
Total	414 (90%)	37 (8%)	459

In order of frequency, the most commonly identified responses were: “Touching it” (69% of respondents), “Moving it” (42%), “Striking/hitting it” (34%), “Kicking it” (16%), “Throwing things at it” (16%), and “Fire” (12%). Three percent of respondents added “Playing with it” (3%).


As seen in the table above, rates varied across age and gender, with young girls (10-14) answering with “Don’t know” (24%) with greater frequency compared to the overall population average of 8%. Eighteen percent of IDPs

answered “Don’t know” compared to 7% of the population surveyed who had not left their home due to the recent fighting. Among persons with at least one indicator of disability, 13% answered “Don’t know” compared to 7% of persons without indicators of disability.

Regarding knowledge of how to report ERW, 78% of respondents answered “Dial 100” to report information about ERWs to the authorities. Rates varied across gender, age, governorate, and residency status. The youngest and oldest respondents were less likely to answer “Dial 100” (69% and 61% respectively), as were those in North Gaza and Khan Yunis (66% each). Commonly cited “other” responses were calling Civil Defense, the police, and engineers. Among children 10-14 years of age, 69% responded “Dial 100,” 19% responded “Don’t know,” and 9% would notify an elder or family member. The remaining 3% would call Civil Defense, the police, or notify a friend.

Thirteen percent of females answered “Don’t know” compared to 5% of males when asked how to report ERW. Eleven percent of the population surveyed with refugee residency status answered “Don’t know” compared to 3% of those without. Finally, those surveyed in North Gaza or Rafah were more likely to not know how to report ERW to the authorities (21% and 19% respectively) compared to Gaza (3%), Middle Area (7%), and Khan Yunis (2%).

Q14. Do you know how to report information about ERWs to the authorities?




Q14. Do you know how to report information about ERW to the authorities?				
	Dial 100	Other	Don't know	Total
Gender and Age				
Male 10-14	32 (68%)	6 (13%)	9 (19%)	47
Female 10-14	32 (70%)	5 (11%)	9 (20%)	46
Male 15-24	65 (87%)	9 (12%)	1 (1%)	75
Female 15-24	57 (80%)	8 (11%)	6 (9%)	71
Male 25-39	43 (74%)	15 (26%)	0	58
Female 25-39	51 (86%)	3 (5%)	5 (9%)	59
Male 40-64	35 (78%)	8 (18%)	2 (4%)	45
Female 40-64	30 (75%)	5 (13%)	5 (13%)	40
Male 65+	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0	10
Female 65+	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	3 (38%)	8
Current location				
North Gaza	46 (66%)	9 (13%)	15 (21%)	70
Gaza	106 (88%)	10 (8%)	4 (3%)	120
Middle Area	65 (93%)	0	5 (7%)	70
Khan Yunis	85 (66%)	41 (32%)	3 (2%)	129
Rafah	54 (77%)	3 (4%)	13 (19%)	70
Total	356 (78%)	63 (14%)	40 (9%)	459

Attitudes

Nearly half of respondents (47%) feel afraid or worried because of ERW on a daily basis. Women are more likely to report feeling afraid on a daily basis (57%) than men (38%). In all age groups, men were more likely to say they are never afraid or worried because of ERW. Additionally, 58% of IDPs feel afraid or worried on a daily basis, compared to 46% among those who had not left their home due to the recent fighting. Among those with at least one indicator of disability, 62% feel afraid or worried on a daily basis, compared to 42% among those with no indicator of disability.


Q9. How often do you feel afraid or worried because of ERW?



Q9. How often do you feel afraid or worried because of ERW?									
	Every day	Every week	Every month	Every 3 months	Every 6 months	Every year	Never	Don't know	Total
Gender and Age									
Male 10-14	24 (52%)	5 (11%)	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	12 (26%)	1 (2%)	46
Female 10-14	27 (59%)	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	6 (13%)	1 (2%)	46
Male 15-24	19 (25%)	10 (13%)	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	6 (8%)	6 (8%)	24 (32%)	2 (3%)	75
Female 15-24	31 (44%)	2 (3%)	7 (10%)	6 (9%)	5 (7%)	5 (7%)	12 (17%)	1 (1%)	70
Male 25-39	19 (33%)	3 (5%)	7 (12%)	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	2 (4%)	20 (35%)	0	57
Female 25-39	37 (63%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)	2 (3%)	4 (7%)	3 (5%)	7 (12%)	0	59
Male 40-64	19 (42%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	0	2 (4%)	3 (7%)	12 (27%)	2 (4%)	45
Female 40-64	25 (64%)	1 (3%)	5 (13%)	1 (3%)	0	1 (3%)	5 (13%)	0	39
Male 65+	7 (70%)	0	1 (10%)	0	0	0	2 (20%)	0	10
Female 65+	6 (75%)	0	0	0	0	1 (13%)	0	1 (13%)	8
Current location									
North Gaza	48 (69%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0	11 (16%)	3 (4%)	70
Gaza	69 (58%)	6 (5%)	0	3 (3%)	0	5 (4%)	28 (23%)	4 (3%)	120
Middle Area	39 (57%)	6 (9%)	11 (16%)	1 (2%)	0	1 (2%)	10 (15%)	0	68
Khan Yunis	39 (31%)	9 (7%)	8 (6%)	3 (2%)	13 (10%)	10 (8%)	45 (35%)	0	127
Rafah	19 (27%)	7 (10%)	11 (16%)	8 (11%)	9 (13%)	9 (13%)	6 (9%)	1 (1%)	70
Total	214 (47%)	31 (7%)	32 (7%)	16 (4%)	23 (5%)	25 (6%)	100 (22%)	8 (2%)	455

Eight percent of participants indicated unsafe attitudes toward handling and submitting potential ERW to the authorities when asked if they agree or disagree with the statement: “If you see a strange object that might be an ERW, you should take the object to the authorities.” Responses were similar across age, gender, and suspected vulnerable groups, with the notable exception of Middle Area, where 39% of those surveyed agreed that potential ERW should be taken to the authorities.


Q12. If you see a strange object that might be an ERW, you should take the object to the authorities.



Q12. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: If you see a strange object that might be an ERW, you should take the object to the authorities.				
	I agree	I disagree	No response	Total
Gender and Age				
Male 10-14	5 (11%)	42 (90%)	0	47
Female 10-14	6 (13%)	40 (87%)	0	46
Male 15-24	6 (8%)	69 (92%)	0	75
Female 15-24	2 (3%)	69 (97%)	0	71
Male 25-39	5 (9%)	53 (91%)	0	58
Female 25-39	6 (10%)	53 (90%)	0	59
Male 40-64	5 (11%)	39 (87%)	1 (2%)	45
Female 40-64	2 (5%)	38 (95%)	0	40
Male 65+	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0	10
Female 65+	0	8 (100%)	0	8
Current location				
North Gaza	5 (7%)	65 (93%)	0	70
Gaza	1 (0.8%)	119 (99%)	0	120
Middle Area	27 (39%)	43 (61%)	0	70
Khan Yunis	3 (2%)	125 (97%)	1 (0.8%)	129
Rafah	2 (3%)	68 (97%)	0	70
Total	38 (8%)	420 (92%)	1 (0.2%)	459

Nearly all respondents (96%) believe that found ERW should be reported to the authorities. Young children were more likely to disagree with this statement (10%) compared to the overall population (2%), but based on results from Q14, they could be more likely to report the information to an elder or family member as a first step, rather than go directly to the authorities.


Q13. If you have found an ERW, you should report the information to the authorities.



Q13. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: If you have found an ERW, you should report the information to the authorities.				
	I agree	I disagree	No response	Total
Gender and Age				
Male 10-14	42 (89%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	47
Female 10-14	40 (87%)	6 (13%)	0	46
Male 15-24	75 (100%)	0	0	75
Female 15-24	70 (99%)	0	1 (1%)	71
Male 25-39	58 (100%)	0	0	58
Female 25-39	59 (100%)	0	0	59
Male 40-64	43 (96%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	45
Female 40-64	38 (95%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	40
Male 65+	10 (100%)	0	0	10
Female 65+	7 (88%)	0	1 (13%)	8
Current location				
North Gaza	66 (94%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	70
Gaza	118 (98%)	0	2 (2%)	120
Middle Area	64 (91%)	6 (9%)	0	70
Khan Yunis	125 (97%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	129
Rafah	69 (99%)	1 (1%)	0	70
Total	442 (96%)	11 (2%)	6 (1%)	459

Children (under the age of 14) were highlighted most often when respondents were asked which populations need more risk education. Other responses outside of age groups included people living in the eastern or border areas, people with disabilities, farmers, illiterate people, scrap workers, street children, people with Down Syndrome, the elderly, and people whose homes were destroyed.

Q18. Which groups in your community do you think need more risk education?



Q18. Which groups in your community do you think need more risk education?	
Boys (under 14)	416 (91%)
Girls (under 14)	361 (79%)
Adolescent/Young Adult Boys (15-24)	209 (46%)
Adolescent/Young Adult Girls (15-24)	158 (34%)
Men (25+)	94 (20%)
Women (25+)	76 (17%)
Other (Specify)	47 (10%)
Don't know	4 (1%)
No response	1 (0.2%)
None	0


Practices

The third key component of the KAP Survey involved questions relating to people's practices involving ERW. Some of the questions asked what actions participants had actually taken in the past, some asked about current behavior, and other questions asked what they would do if they found themselves in a specific scenario.


At the beginning of the survey, participants were shown pictures of ERW and asked if they had ever seen something similar during or after the recent war. The data collectors were given clear instructions to make sure that the participant understood that (1) they were indicating the ERW in the pictures and not the poster/picture itself and (2) they were indicating bombs that were unexploded on the ground as opposed to in the air. The results, broken down by age/gender and governorate, are shown in the tables below.

Overall, about half of respondents (48%) had seen ERW during or after the recent conflict. Men were much more likely to have seen ERW than women (62% versus 33%). Those who reported seeing ERW almost always reported it in either their current home governorate or, in the case of IDPs, in their former home governorate.

Q3. Have you seen something like this during or after the recent war?



Q3. Have you seen something like this during or after the recent war?			
	Yes	No	Total
Gender and Age			
Male 10-14	26 (55%)	21 (45%)	47
Female 10-14	12 (26%)	34 (74%)	46
Male 15-24	50 (67%)	25 (33%)	75
Female 15-24	23 (32%)	48 (68%)	71
Male 25-39	38 (66%)	20 (34%)	58
Female 25-39	22 (37%)	37 (63%)	59
Male 40-64	27 (60%)	18 (40%)	45
Female 40-64	15 (38%)	25 (63%)	40
Male 65+	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	10
Female 65+	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	8
Current location			
North Gaza	48 (69%)	22 (31%)	70
Gaza	45 (38%)	75 (63%)	120
Middle Area	35 (50%)	35 (50%)	70
Khan Yunis	63 (49%)	66 (51%)	129
Rafah	28 (40%)	42 (60%)	70
Total	219 (48%)	240 (52%)	459

Q4. What did you do when you encountered this item?

Question 4 asked the respondents who had seen ERW about what actions they took after encountering the item. Five percent of respondents admitted to tampering with the ERW by throwing it or moving it. A few respondents also provided “Other” responses that showed dangerous behavior (“Carry it”, “Touch it”, “Take it outside”). IDPs were more likely to have moved ERW (9%) compared to non-IDPs (4%). Respondents living in Middle Area or Khan Yunis were more likely to report moving a suspected item of ERW (9% and 8% respectively) compared to the population average of 4%.

Men were more likely to have reported the ERW to authorities (38% versus 10% among women), whereas women more likely to stay away from ERW (87% versus 70%).

Q4. What did you do when you encountered this item?									
	Stayed away from it	Threw it	Moved it	Marked the area	Reported it to authorities	Told someone in my family	Other	Don't know	Total
Gender and Age									
Male 10-14	17 (65%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0	4 (15%)	3 (26%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	26
Female 10-14	10 (83%)	0	0	0	0	2 (17%)	0	0	12
Male 15-24	39 (78%)	0	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	15 (30%)	3 (6%)	3 (6%)	0	50
Female 15-24	18 (78%)	0	1 (4%)	0	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0	23
Male 25-39	24 (63%)	0	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	22 (58%)	2 (5%)	4 (11%)	0	38
Female 25-39	21 (95%)	0	1 (5%)	0	2 (9%)	3 (14%)	0	0	22
Male 40-64	17 (63%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	13 (48%)	0	4 (15%)	2 (7%)	27
Female 40-64	13 (87%)	0	0	0	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	15
Male 65+	4 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	4
Female 65+	2 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	2
Current location									
North Gaza	32 (67%)	0	1 (2%)	0	12 (25%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	3 (6%)	48
Gaza	43 (96%)	1 (2%)	0	3 (7%)	15 (33%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	0	45
Middle Area	21 (60%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	0	10 (29%)	1 (3%)	0	3 (9%)	35
Khan Yunis	47 (75%)	0	5 (8%)	0	14 (22%)	5 (8%)	8 (13%)	1 (2%)	63
Rafah	22 (79%)	0	0	0	12 (43%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	0	28
Total	165 (75%)	2 (1%)	9 (4%)	3 (1%)	63 (29%)	15 (7%)	16 (7%)	5 (2%)	219


When questioned about future behavior if they saw ERW (Q5), respondents exhibited similar patterns. However, fewer respondents said they would be willing to touch ERW today. Children 10-14 remained less likely to report ERW to authorities (48%) than those aged 15+ (78%), but more likely to tell someone in their family (25% versus 7%). These results complement the results from Q12.

Question 7 asked respondents if they had ever entered an area that they suspected might have ERW. Male (35%) were more likely than females (21%) to have entered an area that was suspected to have ERW. This was true for every age group under 65+, above which no men or women reported having entered an area suspected of contamination. Respondents in Rafah were slightly more likely to answer Yes to this question (36%) than the sample overall (29%).

Respondents with an indicator of any disability were slightly more likely to answer “Yes” to this question (35%) than


respondents with no indicator of disability (27%). It is difficult to make more specific remarks about this demographic due to small sample sizes, but the sample suggests that this trend may be particularly pronounced among those with difficulties learning and understanding.

Q7. Have you ever entered an area that you suspected might have ERW?



Q7. Have you ever entered an area that you suspected might have ERW?			
	Yes	No	Total
Gender and Age			
Male 10-14	15 (32%)	32 (68%)	47
Female 10-14	7 (15%)	39 (85%)	46
Male 15-24	32 (43%)	43 (57%)	75
Female 15-24	15 (21%)	56 (79%)	71
Male 25-39	23 (40%)	35 (60%)	58
Female 25-39	15 (25%)	44 (75%)	59
Male 40-64	13 (29%)	32 (71%)	45
Female 40-64	11 (28%)	29 (73%)	40
Male 65+	0	10 (100%)	10
Female 65+	0	8 (100%)	8
Current location			
North Gaza	19 (27%)	51 (73%)	70
Gaza City	34 (28%)	86 (72%)	120
Middle Area	19 (27%)	51 (73%)	70
Khan Yunis	34 (26%)	95 (74%)	129
Rafah	25 (36%)	45 (64%)	70
Total	130 (28%)	329 (72%)	459


Question 8 followed up on the previous question, asking why respondents had entered an area they suspected of having ERW contamination. Unexpectedly, 21% of respondents who reported entered an area suspected to have ERW did so out of curiosity, the most commonly cited reason for entering dangerous areas. Other common reasons were to collect items from a damaged home (19%), farming (15%), and visiting friends and family (12%).



Risk Education

An important component of this baseline was to assess the coverage of risk education in Gaza so as to inform future strategic interventions. Question 15 asked respondents if they had ever received information about the dangers of ERW in the past. The table below shows the responses:

Q15. Have you ever received information about the dangers of ERW in the past?




Q15. Have you ever received information about the dangers of ERW in the past?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Gender and Age				
Male 10-14	23 (49%)	24 (51%)	0	47
Female 10-14	23 (50%)	23 (50%)	0	46
Male 15-24	32 (43%)	42 (56%)	1 (1%)	75
Female 15-24	37 (52%)	34 (48%)	0	71
Male 25-39	29 (50%)	29 (50%)	0	58
Female 25-39	29 (49%)	30 (51%)	0	59
Male 40-64	18 (40%)	26 (58%)	1 (2%)	45
Female 40-64	16 (40%)	24 (60%)	0	40
Male 65+	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0	10
Female 65+	0	8 (100%)	0	8
Current location				
North Gaza	24 (34%)	45 (64%)	1 (1%)	70
Gaza	53 (44%)	67 (56%)	0	120
Middle Area	18 (26%)	52 (74%)	0	70
Khan Yunis	72 (56%)	56 (43%)	1 (0.8%)	129
Rafah	41 (59%)	29 (41%)	0	70
Total	208 (45%)	249 (54%)	2 (0.4%)	459

45% of the overall population surveyed had received information about the dangers of ERW in the past. The data showed some variation in rates across groups, particularly in regards to age, governorate, IDP status, and persons with indicators of disability. People in the age ranges of 40-64 and 65+ were less likely to have received risk education messages in the past (40% and 6% respectively) compared to the younger segments of the population surveyed. The survey showed that a lesser proportion of respondents

had received RE messages in the governorates of North Gaza (34%) and Middle Area (26%) compared to the population average of 45%. 58% of the IDPs surveyed had received RE messages in the past compared to 44% of people who were not living away from their home. Among persons with indicators of disability that were surveyed, 34% had received RE messages in the past compared to 49% of persons who claimed to have no indicators of disability.

Among those who have received RE messages, the most common means of receiving the information (Q16) was through a school teacher (43%), followed by television (26%), leaflets (23%), radio (18%), NGO worker (15%), posters (10%), internet (8%), family (3%), billboards, mosque, and SMS (2% each).

Q16. How was the information given to you?



Responses to how information was given varied greatly across governorate and age groups. Children 10-14 were less likely to have received RE messages from the radio (9%) compared to the general population (18%) and also less likely to have received it from television (13%) compared to the population average of 26%.

Among mass media, radio was a more common response in Khan Yunis (40%) compared to 13% in North Gaza, 6% in Gaza, 5% in Rafah, and 0% in Middle Area. Television, as a means to receive RE messages, was a more common response in Khan Yunis (44%) compared to 23% in Gaza, 17% in North Gaza, 12% in Rafah, and 11% in Middle Area. Internet was a more common answer in Gaza and North Gaza (each 13%) compared to Khan Yunis (7%), Middle Area (6%) and Rafah (3%). Receiving information via SMS was only mentioned in Gaza (8%) with the rest of the governorates at 0%.

Among small media, leaflets were a more common response in Gaza (35%) compared to 32% in Khan Yunis, 17% in Middle Area, 10% in Rafah, and 0% in North Gaza. Receiving safety information from posters was most common in

Khan Yunis (14%) compared to 12% in Gaza, 11% in Middle Area, 5% in Rafah, and 4% in North Gaza. “NGO Worker” was a more common response in Gaza (23%) compared to Middle Area (22%), Rafah (20%), Gaza North (17%), and Khan Yunis (4%).


Questions 17 asked respondents who had been exposed to RE messages how often they received this information over the past twelve months. The most common answer in the population surveyed was “Every six months” (34%) followed by “Did not receive risk education information in the last 12 months” (26%), “Every three months” (14%), “Every month” (11%), “Every week” (9%), and “Every day” (3%). Children 10-14 were less likely not to have received safety information within the past year (11%) compared to the overall population (26%). Children were also more likely to have said that they receive safety information every day (7%) compared to the overall population average of 3%.

Impact and Support

In addition to the knowledge, attitudes, practices, and risk education components, this survey also asked several questions regarding post-conflict impact and support. Question 22 aimed to get a sense of how personal networks have been affected by the conflict directly. Overall, 66% of

respondents knew of a family member or member of their neighborhood injured or killed by shelling or bombing during the recent conflict. 3% of respondents reported knowing a family member or neighbor who was injured or killed by unexploded ordnance.


Q22. Were any members of your family or neighborhood injured or killed as a result of any of the following?



Q22. Were any members of your family or neighborhood injured or killed as a result of any of the following?					
	Shelling/ bombing during the recent conflict	An accident with unexploded ordnance during or after the recent conflict	Doesn't know anyone who was injured or killed because of these reasons	Don't know	Total
North Gaza	50 (71%)	4 (6%)	18 (26%)	1 (1%)	70
Gaza	63 (53%)	2 (2%)	53 (44%)	2 (2%)	120
Middle Area	36 (51%)	4 (6%)	29 (41%)	1 (1%)	70
Khan Yunis	103 (80%)	3 (2%)	20 (16%)	4 (3%)	129
Rafah	53 (76%)	0	17 (24%)	0	70
Total	305 (66%)	13 (3%)	137 (30%)	8 (2%)	459

Regarding access to the critical post-conflict services of healthcare, physical rehabilitation, and psycho-social support, 20% of respondents overall said that their community had none of these services available. Notably, this figure jumped to 43% in Rafah. Only 14% of respondents in Rafah knew of physical rehabilitation services available, compared to 38% of respondents overall. Respondents in Gaza and Khan Yunis were less likely to report access to psycho-social support (13% and 17% respectively), compared to 22% overall.

Q21. Do people in your community currently have access to any of the following services?



Q21. Do people in your community currently have access to any of the following services?							
	Hospital/health services	Physical rehab	Psycho-social support	None of these services	Don't know	No response	Total
North Gaza	61 (87%)	30 (43%)	18 (26%)	7 (10%)	3 (4%)	0	70
Gaza	90 (75%)	51 (43%)	15 (13%)	25 (21%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)	120
Middle Area	49 (70%)	35 (50%)	33 (47%)	20 (29%)	4 (6%)	0	70
Khan Yunis	111 (86%)	49 (38%)	22 (17%)	9 (7%)	5 (4%)	0	129
Rafah	36 (51%)	10 (14%)	14 (20%)	30 (43%)	0	1 (1%)	70
Total	347 (76%)	175 (38%)	102 (22%)	91 (20%)	16 (3%)	2 (0.4%)	459

Qualitative Data

The focus groups consisted of 31 men, women, and children over 10 years old. The data collectors were requested to set up focus groups of approximately 6-8 individuals, with mixed-gender groups consisting of adults with disabilities (over 18), children (10-14), or adolescents (15-18). Four focus groups were completed in total: one with children in Gaza (11 participants), two in Gaza with adults with disabilities (7 participants) and adolescents (7 participants), and one in Khan Yunis with adults with disabilities (6 participants). The focus groups conducted reinforced the findings of the quantitative survey as well as added additional depth to the data.

The majority of children and adolescents in the focus groups had seen ERW in their communities, while most of the adults with disabilities had not. Most participants agreed that going into areas that might contain ERW is not safe, but many said that people in their communities were entering regardless, especially children. Children were reported to be playing in areas containing ERW with some focus group participants reporting that the children don't know about the dangers and others thinking that the children know about the dangers but disregard them.

Similar to the quantitative survey, all of the focus groups

mentioned that people in their communities were entering these areas due to "curiosity". Upon further questioning, it is believed that some of these answers may be attributed to the popularity of taking photos of ERW for social media websites, which was mentioned by all of the focus groups. Additionally, focus group participants spoke of people collecting ERW either to sell for money or to keep in their homes as "souvenirs" of the conflict. One scrap metal dealer interviewed during the project relayed that he is brought ERW so often by collectors that he no longer calls the police and just sends the ERW back with collector instead.

When asked about their favorite risk education activity, children and adolescents said theater, songs, and TV/video. The focus group with children also mentioned billboards, which is an option that has not widely been used in Gaza but has the potential to reach large numbers of people. The adult focus groups mentioned social media as a po-

tential channel to disseminate these messages.

Key Findings

Despite high levels of education in the population surveyed, significant gaps remain in knowledge of ERW. 22% of the population surveyed could not name at least one way that places where there are ERW are marked, 8% of the population surveyed could not name at least one thing that causes ERW to explode, and 9% of the respondents did not know how to report ERW to the authorities. Several groups scored much lower on these questions, specifically young boys and girls (10-14), persons with at least one indicator of disability, and those living in the governorates of North Gaza and Middle Area.

Regarding attitudes, most respondents are worried about ERW contamination and believe ERW should be reported to authorities. Nearly half of respondents reported feeling afraid or worried because of ERW on a daily basis. 8% of total participants indicated an unsafe attitude in the belief that they should bring ERW to the authorities. This belief was significantly higher in Middle Area, where 39% of those surveyed reported this belief. Nearly all respondents (96%) agreed that ERW should be reported to the authorities, with young children also likely to report the information to an elder or family member. When asked which groups in these communities need more risk education, the two most common responses were boys (91%) and girls (79%) followed by adolescents.

Overall, about half of respondents (48%) had seen ERW during or after the recent conflict. Gender was a key factor in this. Males were much more likely to have reported seeing ERW (62%) than females (33%). Of those that had seen ERW, 5% of respondents admitted to tampering with the ERW by throwing it or moving it. Although 70% of the population were able to give the correct answer about how to report ERW (by dialing 100), only 29% of those that had seen ERW had actually reported it. Men were more likely to have reported the ERW to authorities (38%) compared to women (10%). When questioned about future behavior regarding ERW, fewer respondents said they would be willing to touch ERW. Children remained less likely to report ERW to authorities (48%) than those over the age of 15 (78%), but more likely to tell someone in their family (25% versus 7%).

Males (35%) were more likely than females (21%) to have entered an area that was suspected to have ERW. Respon-

dents in Rafah were slightly more likely to have entered such an area (36%) than the sample overall (29%). Of those who had entered an area suspected to have ERW, the most common reasons mentioned for doing so were curiosity (21%), returning to collect items from a home that was damaged (19%), farming (15%), and visiting friends and family (12%). The “curiosity” response was partially clarified by focus group data across all ages that discussed the popularity of taking photos of ERW and of keeping ERW in private homes as “souvenirs” of the conflict.

45% of the overall population surveyed had received RE in the past. The survey showed that a lesser proportion of respondents had received RE messages in the governorates of North Gaza (34%) and Middle Area (26%). 34% of persons with indicators of disability that were surveyed had received RE messages in the past, compared to 49% with no indicators of disability. The most common means of receiving the information cited were through a school teacher (43%), television (26%), leaflets (23%), radio (18%), NGO worker (15%), and posters (10%). Responses to how information was given varied greatly across governorate. Children 10-14 were less likely to have received RE messages from the radio (9%) compared to the general population (18%) and also less likely to have received risk education messages from television (13%) compared to the population average of 26%.

Overall, 66% of respondents knew of a family member or member of their neighborhood injured or killed by shelling or bombing during the recent conflict. 3% of respondents reported knowing a family member or neighbor who was injured or killed by unexploded ordnance. Respondents in Rafah were the least likely to report access to hospital/health services (51%) compared to the total population surveyed (76%). Respondents from Rafah also reported to the lowest access to physical rehabilitation (14%) compared to the population average of 38%. Respondents in Gaza and Khan Yunis were less likely to report access to psycho-social support (13% and 17% respectively), compared to 22% overall.

High-risk Profiles

Boys

Over the past five years, young males under the age of 18 have made up 48% of the injuries and 41% of the fatalities attributed to ERW. The boys interviewed show indicators

of reckless behavior, knowing about safe behavior but ignoring it, with smaller percentage showing a lack of information about safe behaviors that could classify them as uninformed or misinformed. In the survey, the age group of boys 10-14 scored the lowest on knowledge of ERW:

- 40% could not name at least one way that ERW are marked compared to the overall population average of 22%
- 15% could not name something that causes ERW to explode compared to the overall population average of 8%
- 19% did not know how to report ERW to authorities compared to the overall population average of 9%

Regarding attitudes, boys were slightly more likely to report never being worried about ERW (26%) compared to the overall population average (22%). Boys were more likely to agree to that ERW should be brought to authorities (11%) compared to the overall population (8%) and more likely to disagree that ERW should be reported to the authorities (6%) compared to the overall population average (2%).

Regarding practices, 55% of the boys surveyed had seen ERW in their communities. Of those that had seen it, 4% reported throwing the ERW and 4% reported moving it. 15% of the boys reported that they had reported it to the authorities. 32% reported that they had knowingly entered an area that they suspected to have ERW. When asked why they had entered, 27% reported "playing", 27% reported "returning to collect items from my home that was damaged", 20% reported "curiosity", and 13% reported "looking for items of value."

Of the population that we surveyed, about half (51%) of boys 10-14 reported that they had not received information about the dangers of ERW in the past. 91% of the entire population surveyed thought that this age group needed more RE. Of those boys who had received RE messages, 78% said that they had received them from a school teacher, 22% from leaflets, 13% from television, 9% from radio, and 9% from posters. When asked in focus groups to discuss their favorite RE activities, children 10-14 mentioned theater, songs, films, posters, and billboards.

Internally-Displaced Persons

Internally-Displaced Persons (IDPs) showed slightly lower knowledge than the general population. Combined with a perceived need to return to damaged homes to recover

things of value (material or sentimental), they are one of the most at-risk populations in Gaza. Much of the risk-taking could be categorized as intentional, where the person thinks that they have no choice but to adopt unsafe behaviors, along with uninformed, where the person knows about the risks but no about safe behavior.

Regarding knowledge, when asked what can make an ERW explode, 18% of IDPs answered "Don't know" compared to 7% of the population surveyed who had not left their home due to the recent fighting.

For attitudes, IDPs were more likely to agree that they should bring ERW to the authorities (11%) compared to 8% of non-IDPs. IDPs were also more likely to disagree that they should report ERW to the authorities (9%) compared to non-IDPs (2%). It was more common for IDPs to report feeling afraid or worried about ERW on a daily basis (58%) compared to the overall population average (46%).

Regarding practices, IDPs were more likely to have entered an area that they suspected to have ERW (33%) compared to non-IDPs (28%). Among those that had entered such an area, the most common reason was "returned to collect items from a home that was damaged (57%) followed by farming (14%), looking items of value (7%), and searching for water/food (7%).

58% of the IDPs surveyed had received RE messages in the past compared to 44% of people who were not living away from their home. The most common channel by which IDPs had received RE messages were television (31%), school teachers (27%), leaflets (15%), NGO worker (15%), radio (12%), posters (8%), and internet (8%).

Persons with disabilities

Persons with disabilities should also be considered an at-risk population in Gaza due to a lack of knowledge about ERW and safe behaviors and the high prevalence of disability in the population. 24% of the respondents surveyed reported having one or more indicators of disability. Half of these respondents said that the impairment was due to bombing or shelling during the recent conflict. Survey responses showed a wide variation in the reasons behind unsafe behavior for this group, including being uninformed, misinformed, reckless, and intentional. Given the wide spectrum of types of impairment and levels of impairment

surveyed, this could be expected.

A connecting theme, though, is that persons with at least one indicator of disability were less likely to have received RE in the past (34%) compared to the persons reporting no indicators of disability (49%). Limited mobility, social exclusion, and communication difficulties generally contribute to this trend that is seen in many countries with similar ongoing RE efforts. In this study, the most common ways that persons with indicators of disability reported receiving RE messages were school teacher (37%), leaflets (26%), television (21%), posters (13%), and NGO workers (13%).

Regarding knowledge, persons with at least one indicator of disability were more likely to answer “Don’t know” (35%) regarding how places with ERW are marked compared to those with no indicators of disability (17%). When asked what makes an ERW explode, 13% of persons with at least one indicator of disability answered “Don’t know” compared to 7% of persons without indicators of disability.

Persons with at least one indicator of disability were more likely to agree that they should bring ERW to authorities (12%) compared to 7% of the population with no reported indicators of disability. Among those with at least one indicator of disability, 62% feel afraid or worried because of ERW on a daily basis, compared to 42% among those with no indicator of disability.

Regarding practices, persons with at least one indicator of disability were more likely to have entered an area they suspected of having ERW (35%) compared to those without any indicators (27%). The most common reasons given for entering such areas were returning home to collect items from a home that was damaged (29%), farming (21%), and curiosity (16%).

Recommendations

This baseline assessment showed gaps in knowledge and the continued prevalence of high-risk attitudes and practices in Gaza, demonstrating a need for additional campaigns that deliver risk education messages to the entire population. The surveys, focus groups, and key informant interviews also highlighted issues that could be improved and areas where more focus is needed:

1. Ensure that resources are allocated to make RE a priority for children. Children, particularly young boys, were identified by the data analysis, the respondents themselves, and by recent casualty data as a major high-risk group in Gaza regarding ERW contamination. This survey found that only half of the children surveyed claimed that they had received information about the dangers of ERW in the past despite high levels of school attendance, in general, in Gaza. Efforts should be made to ensure that RE is integrated into the school curriculum as soon as possible and complemented by additional out-of-school RE that is actively engaging. With 94% of schools running half-day sessions for two separate groups of students, many children are spending more time than usual out of school during this critical time of rubble removal and reconstruction with ERW continuing to be uncovered.

2. Designate the entire frontline of rubble removal and reconstruction as a target for RE and other support. The majority of the rubble removal and reconstruction efforts will likely take place outside of the UNDP program and will therefore not be supported

directly by UNMAS under the current plan. Efforts should be made to ensure that all of the private contractors working on these projects (formal or informal) be targeted to receive safety information. Included in this group should be internally-displaced persons returning to their homes to search for items and the various actors in the scrap metal industry, both collectors and dealers, who are also one of the most at-risk populations for directly or indirectly contributing to ERW accidents. For these groups, where identification of potential ERW is crucial and relationships for follow-up support needed, it is suggested that they be targeted by face-to-face RE interventions given by NGOs.

3. Prioritize RE to high-risk governorates. This survey showed that the respondents from the governorates of North Gaza and Middle Area were less likely to have received safety information in the past and scored lower overall on questions regarding knowledge of ERW and safe attitudes and practices. This new data should be incorporated into the prioritization of RE that is currently underway in various organizations, though care should be taken to avoid duplication of efforts by different organization in the same area. Below is a summary of the suggested focus for messaging for individual governorates based on the survey results:

4. Increase cooperation among RE actors and standardize safety messages, monitoring, and evaluation. Currently, various local and international organizations are undertaking risk education in Gaza using separate training procedures and methodologies for delivering key messages to beneficiaries, including target

Governorate	Messaging
North Gaza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to report to authorities - How ERW are marked - Do not touch ERW
Gaza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do not touch ERW
Middle Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How ERW are marked - Don't bring ERW to authorities - Report ERW to authorities - Do not touch ERW
Khan Yunis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to report to authorities - How ERW are marked - Do not touch ERW
Rafah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to report to authorities - How ERW are marked - Do not enter areas that you suspect to have ERW

groups such as children. These key messages should be agreed upon within the sector, and an accreditation process for risk education operators should be phased in to ensure transparency and high quality services (though not at the cost of delays at this vital time). Each organization conducting risk education in Gaza is also utilizing a separate monitoring and evaluation system. Instead, a comprehensive single method should be discussed, agreed upon, and used throughout the sector.

5. Develop more inclusive Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials and RE activities. Given the correlation between high-risk behavior and indicators of disability found in the survey, efforts should be made to mainstream disability into risk education. This should include building the capacity of risk education operators to more effectively target persons with disabilities and to craft and deliver messages through appropriate means of communication for the spectrum of disability in Gaza.

6. Integrate RE across humanitarian and development interventions (with a focus on protection and health sectors). Increasing the reach of RE to more effectively and efficiently include hard-to-target groups such as internally-displaced persons and persons with disabilities could be improved by increasing cooperation and links with national and local organizations already focusing on issues that affect these groups. This could include, for example, a systematic integration of safety messages into the already existing outreach work of these organizations. This could involve the inclusion of

basic IEC materials and generic safety messages into larger emergency relief and distribution programs.

7. Ensure continued support is provided to clearance and victim assistance efforts. Whereas RE is urgently required, ultimately only removal of dangerous items will fully protect civilians from accidents. Clearance, render safe procedures and removal of ERW have already started in Gaza and need to continue if the overall response is to be effective. The international community should also continue to monitor the changing political dynamics of the region to assess whether more direct involvement in clearance by additional actors will be possible.

The need for victim assistance in the form of rehabilitation and psycho-social support should continue to be a priority for the international community. This survey found that two-thirds of the respondents knew of a family member or member of their neighborhood injured or killed by shelling or bombing during the recent conflict. Nearly a quarter of the respondents surveyed reported having one or more indicators of disability, half of which were attributed to the recent conflict.

Finally, with an unemployment rate estimated at 41% in the first quarter of 2014 by the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, additional programs should also be considered regarding sustainable livelihoods to aid families trying to cope with the loss of homes, workplaces, and family members.



Handicap International: 138, avenue des Frères Lumières, 69008 Lyon, France, Phone : +33 (0)4 78 69 79 79

Director of Mine Action, Gilles Delecourt, Phone: +33 (0)4 78 69 79 44, Email : gdelecourt@handicap-international.org /// Programme Manager - Mine Action, Frederic Maio, Mobile French: +33 (0) 6 60 97 09 41, Mobile UK: +44 (0) 7526085288, Email: fmaio@handicap-international.org /// Federal Information Manager, Arnaud Richard, Phone : +33 (0)4 72 76 12 57, +33 (0)7 60 56 02 65, Email: arichard@handicap-international.org

Director of programmes for Middle-East, Jean-Bertrand Lebrun, Phone: + 962 79 96 71 118, Email: jblebrun@hi-me.org