

IOM THAILAND

MULTI-SECTORAL ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

2023



RANONG FACTSHEET

SEPTEMBER - NOVEMBER 2023



GLOBAL DATA INSTITUTE
DISPLACEMENT
TRACKING MATRIX



From
the People of Japan



Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid

DISCLAIMER: This map is for illustration purposes only. The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
DEMOGRAPHICS.....	2
MIGRATION HISTORY.....	3
DOCUMENTATION.....	4
EDUCATION.....	5
EMPLOYMENT.....	6
FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOOD.....	7
PROTECTION.....	8
CHILD PROTECTION.....	9
HEALTH.....	10
WASH AND SHELTER.....	11

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

This publication was made possible through support provided by the US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), European Union Humanitarian Aid (ECHO), and Government of Japan. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the aforementioned parties.

Publisher: IOM Thailand

18th Floor, Rajanakarn Building, 3 South Sathorn Road, Bangkok 10120 Thailand

Tel: (+66) 2-343-9300

Email: DTMThailand@iom.int

Website: <https://dtm.iom.int/thailand>

This publication has been issued without formal editing by IOM. This publication has been issued without IOM Publications Unit (PUB) approval for adherence to IOM's brand and style standards. This publication was issued without IOM Research Unit (RES) endorsement.

Required citation: International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2024. *Multi-Sectoral Assessment of Needs 2023: Ranong Factsheet*. IOM Thailand, Bangkok.

© IOM 2024

Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 IGO License \(CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 IGO\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/).*

For further specifications please see the [Copyright and Terms of Use](#).

This publication should not be used, published or redistributed for purposes primarily intended for or directed towards commercial advantage or monetary compensation, with the exception of educational purposes, e.g. to be included in textbooks.

* <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/legalcode>

Overview of the Multi-Sectoral Assessment of Needs

This factsheet aims to provide a snapshot of multi-sectoral conditions, needs, and challenges among Myanmar migrants in Ranong province as captured between September and November 2023 by IOM Thailand's multi-sectoral assessment of needs. The purpose of this assessment is to provide insights regarding the severity of needs among migrant populations, identify vulnerable population groups and geographic areas with the most acute needs, inform assistance planning and relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets, and provide sectoral and inter-sectoral baselines for future assessments.

Methodology

The tool was developed by IOM's Migration Data and Research Unit (MDRU) in collaboration with various sectoral IOM units specialized in labour, health, protection topics, among others. The survey is conducted at household level, but also includes questions for which the respondent had to answer on behalf of every member of their household (for example, the ages of all members of the household). IOM surveyed a representative sample randomly selected within the population of interest, which included Myanmar migrants in Ranong. IOM sought an equal balance between female and male respondents. In Ranong, answers from 636 respondents were analysed. Counting all respondents and their household members, 1,772 individuals are represented by this assessment.

Due to the high number of indicators of interest, the survey was split into two tools: tool 1 focusing on questions about multi-sectoral conditions (MSA) and tool 2 on access to services (ASI). Respondents were interviewed using either one of these tools, never both. Some questions, however, particularly those regarding demographics and migration history, were covered in both tools to understand the basic profiles of all participating respondents and their households. As a result, the sample size for data analysis varies between indicators. Questions which appeared only in one of the tools are representative at a 90 per cent confidence interval with a 5 per cent margin of error. Questions which were covered in both tools have a 95 per cent confidence interval with a 5 per cent margin of error.


Primary data collection period

Data was collected from 27 September to 29 November 2023.

Limitations


Certain indicators may be under-reported or over-reported, due to the subjectivity and perceptions of respondents (especially "social desirability bias"— the documented tendency of people to provide what they perceive to be the "right" answers to certain questions). These biases should be taken into consideration when interpreting findings. In addition, the findings are representative for the assessed provinces, but cannot be extrapolated to other regions of Thailand. Some questions were only asked to a subset of respondents who answered affirmatively to preceding questions. The analysis on subsets of respondents should only be considered as indicative, as the sample size of the subsets does not meet the threshold required to be statistically significant. Also, graph titles with an asterisk denote questions where respondents could provide multiple answers. As a result, the totals for these graphs may exceed 100 per cent. Finally, where the percentage reported is zero, this does not necessarily imply that zero cases were recorded for a particular answer. It can instead indicate that the case number was so low that the results were rounded down to zero.

Provinces where the survey was implemented




The gender makeup of respondents was 58 per cent women and 41 per cent men. There were 1 per cent of respondents who identified as another gender. The average age among respondents was 37.8 years and the average number of people living in surveyed households was 2.8. Regarding vulnerabilities, no households reported having a member with a disability.


RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS




Men



Women



Other gender



Average age

HOUSEHOLD STATISTICS

2.8




Average number of people living in surveyed households

38%







Percentage of households with at least one child

Age pyramid of all individuals in respondent households



Origin regions/states in Myanmar (top 3 labeled)




Among surveyed migrants in Ranong, the top three states or regions of origin were Tanintharyi (66%), Mon (12%), and Yangon (10%). Some respondents (10%) reported that their most recent migration to Thailand occurred sometime after the military takeover in Myanmar in February 2021. Of these more recent arrivals, 17 per cent indicated that they had lived in Thailand for a total of three years or longer, 58 per cent had lived in Thailand for around two years total, and 25 per cent around one year total (this includes living in Thailand during prior migrations). Among all respondents, 11 per cent reported having engaged in repeat migration to Thailand. The average cost of migration was 4,957 THB (around 140 USD). Respondents indicated paying for services and components such as travel (86%), documentation (61%), brokers (15%), medical exams (9%), and bribes (6%).

Since their most recent migration to Thailand, 38 per cent of respondents have visited Myanmar, including 20 per cent of respondents whose most recent migration took place sometime after the military takeover in Myanmar. Among all respondents, 3 per cent intended to visit Myanmar within the following year. At the same time, 78 per cent responded that they did not know whether they would visit Myanmar in the future and 16 per cent had no intentions of doing so. Meanwhile, 19 per cent intend to return permanently to Myanmar sometime in the future.


Most migrants (75%) reported having the valid documentation required to stay in country, although 25 per cent of respondents are considered to be irregular due to holding incorrect or expired documentation, or no documentation at all. Among those who do possess documentation, the most common types included having an certificate of identity or temporary passport (83%), labour card (23%), and international passport (11%). However, 6 per cent were not aware of how long their documents permitted them to stay in Thailand.

Only 1 per cent of respondents indicated having arrived in Thailand under its Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Myanmar during their most recent migration. Of these, 25 per cent indicated that their MoU agreement is already expired. A further 3 per cent are not aware about the expiration of their work permit.

Based on respondents' information on the documentation status of each individual in assessed households, 76 per cent of households are completely documented, meaning every member has some form of documentation allowing them to stay in Thailand. In 14 per cent of households, over half of all members are documented. However, in 8 per cent of households, less than half of all members are documented, and in an additional 2 per cent of households, no one is documented. Regarding regularization windows that permit undocumented migrants to become documented, respondents were most likely to be aware of the regularisation process but have not pursued it (59%).




Awareness of regularization windows for migrants in Thailand and how to use them




Among adults in assessed households, 43 per cent had less than a primary school education, 46 per cent completed primary school, 9 per cent completed lower secondary school, and 2 per cent had completed upper secondary school or higher. Among all individuals in assessed households, 3 per cent had reached the expected level of education for their age (for example, those between 11 and 15 years old are expected to have completed primary school).

Among children in assessed households, 43 per cent were not attending school or other learning facilities.¹ Overall, 89 per cent of households with primary school-aged children reported experiencing barriers sending children to school. The same was true for 92 per cent of households with secondary school-aged children.




Type of learning spaces attended by children in assessed households³




Main barriers to sending children to school^{1*2}


Among primary school-aged girls




Among primary school-aged boys



Among secondary school-aged girls



Among secondary school-aged boys



¹ Thirty-eight per cent of households had children (n=241).

² Among respondents who cited experiencing barriers sending children to school (19 primary school-aged girls, 6 primary school-aged boys, 3 secondary school-aged girls, 10 secondary school-aged boys).

³ Additionally, 3 per cent of respondents selected do not know and 1 per cent of respondents selected other types of learning spaces.



8.5


Average number of months respondents were employed in the last year



1.2


Average number of employers respondents had in the 12 months prior to being interviewed

Respondent work sectors*



In addition, 1% of respondents reported working in an unlisted sector.

Possession of contracts among respondents who worked in the past year






350 THB

Median daily wage⁴ among respondents (around 10 USD). Approximately 56% reported earning below minimum wage (332 THB).

Reception of wages and benefits during employment





Regarding employment, about half of respondents (49%) had been employed for all 12 months in the last year, while 17 per cent were employed for five or fewer months and 9 per cent did not work at all in the last year. Among those who worked within the year prior, the most common work sectors included food production (39%), agriculture (37%), construction (26%), and domestic work (25%). Respondents also reported manufacturing (13%) and selling goods or food (10%) as other common work sectors.

Regarding agreements with employers, 71 per cent of respondents who worked reported having made a contract, with 12 per cent having a written contract and 59 per cent having only a verbal one. Moreover, 29 per cent of respondents reported not having a contract.


On average, respondents reported working 22.6 days in the month prior to assessment. The median daily wage reported in Ranong was 350 THB per day (10 USD). Furthermore, 56 per cent of respondents were earning below minimum wage (332 THB per day). In addition, 6 per cent reported not receiving all agreed upon wages and benefits during their employment.

⁴ The median daily wage represents the cut off where 50 per cent of respondents earn less than the median and 50 per cent earn more.



Food-related indicators




Top 3 sources of food*




Livelihood-related indicators



Top 3 sources of income*




Top 3 reasons for debt*



Overall, findings regarding food security showed a positive result for most respondents. The Food Consumption Score was acceptable for 99 per cent of households, and 95 per cent indicated no or little hunger, as measured by the Household Hunger Scale. Regarding expenditures, 1 per cent of households spend a high or very high percentage of their household budget on food. Furthermore, 11 per cent of households scored high on the reduced Coping Strategy Index, which captures how many days a household had to adopt coping strategies to deal with lack of food or money to buy it.

Respondents indicated that, on average, their economic status remained unchanged in the past year while their household cost of living increased a little. Household debt was not uncommon (39%), with households owing 23,808 THB (around 664 USD) on average. Reasons for debt included food (54%), housing (48%), and migration costs (46%). Additionally, the average percentage of household expenditure on debt was 5.7 per cent. Sixty-one per cent of households reported sending remittances in the last month. Regarding savings, a quarter (24%) of respondents reported spending more than they earned in the last month.

Savings distribution








Regarding perceptions of safety, the most common risks to adults cited by respondents include substance abuse (45%), domestic violence (27%), and participation in illicit activities (23%). Over a third (35%) did not want to answer.

Overall, 84 per cent of respondents were not aware of any services available to them. Among those who were aware, they were most likely to know about medical services (10%).

Respondents were also asked whether they agree or disagree with statements related to gender roles and perceptions about responsibilities in the household. In general, respondents had positive views about gender equality, with the majority agreeing that women should participate in making important decisions in the household (88%) and be able to express their own opinions (88%). On the other hand, 91 per cent agreed that men should be the providers of their families.

Based on several proxy indicators, 1 per cent of respondents were classified as living in locations with possible trafficking risks.

Top 3 risks faced by adults*



Child marriage was found to be present in 4 per cent of households with children. Child labour was found in none of the assessed households. At the same time, respondents cited child marriage (37%) as a primary risk to girls and child labour (22%) as a primary risk to boys. Sexual abuse (26%) was also reported as one of the main risks to girls, while substance abuse (38%) was reported as the main risk to boys. Additionally, 37 per cent of respondents did not want to answer the question on the main risks faced by girls and boys.



4% Percentage of households with child marriage




0% Percentage of households where children are working over the legal allowances




0% Percentage of households with a child who is not a relative of the respondent

Main risks faced by girls in respondents' locations*




Main risks faced by boys in respondents' locations*



Regarding access to health, almost a quarter (23%) of respondents reported having household members who were in need of healthcare services in the last three months. Among these, 70 per cent went to formal healthcare providers, 29 per cent went to informal, and 1 per cent chose not to access healthcare despite their need. Barriers to accessing healthcare services were experienced by 8 per cent of respondents, who cited language (48%) as the most common barrier. Healthcare expenses (43%) as well as distance (43%) were also common barriers to accessing health services. Regarding children's vaccinations, 87 per cent of children were reported to be up-to-date on their vaccinations and 93 per cent possessed an immunisation card.

Regarding health insurance, 6 per cent of households lacked any insurance. However, in 61 per cent of households, every member had some form of insurance. Government insurance (78%) was the most common insurance type among respondents.


Health access class*




Health access class is based on where household members have sought healthcare in the last three months. Formal health locations include government, private, or NGO hospitals or clinics. Informal include traditional healers, pharmacies, and others.

Health insurance indicators

Proportion of household members with insurance



Types of insurance among respondents






Average rating of usability of health insurance



Note: No respondents cited that using health insurance is difficult or very difficult.



Top 3 barriers to accessing health services*




Diseases among households in the past 6 months*



Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)-related indicators




Waste disposal methods*





Shelter-related indicators

Shelter-type class



Payment of accommodation



With regards to WASH indicators, all respondents lived in areas with safe sources of drinking water. At the same time, 14 per cent lived in the vicinity of visible waste or trash and 16 per cent lived in the vicinity of waste or stagnant water.

Regarding shelter indicators, respondents were asked about the building materials of their accommodation in order to calculate shelter type on a scale of very low to high structural integrity, with 20 per cent found to have poor to very poor structural integrity. Among respondent accommodations, 6 per cent were shared with the respondent's employer. Additionally, 38 per cent were owned by the respondent's employer. Most respondents paid rent for their accommodations.

Among surveyed migrants in Ranong, 98 per cent had access to the electricity grid and 2 per cent used renewable energy.



GLOBAL DATA INSTITUTE
DISPLACEMENT
TRACKING MATRIX