Food Security Sector Working Group Coordination Meeting

6th September 2016
Venue: Chamber of Commerce- HAMRA
1. Socio-economic situation of Palestine Refugees – UNRWA
2. Revision of Coping Strategy Index - LCC
3. MRR presentation - MoSA
4. Communication strategy– WFP
5. Update from the field - North evictions
6. Update on FSS steering committee
7. Update on LCRP 2017-2020
8. AOB
Socio-economic situation of Palestine Refugees

UNRWA
united nations relief and works agency for palestine refugees in the near east
Palestine Refugees: Background

- Palestine refugees depend on UNRWA’s services as they are unable to access the public systems in Lebanon.

- Approximately 50% of Palestine Refugees live inside Palestine Refugee camps.

- PRL population: between **260,000 and 280,000** refugees in Lebanon; overall registered is 450,000 refugees.

- PRS population: **40,333 refugees (11,047 families)** as at 30 June 2016 to whom UNRWA is providing life-saving humanitarian assistance, education and healthcare.

- A headcount of PRS was implemented in July 2016 and assessment is planned mid-September.
Objective
• To provide comprehensive overview of the various aspects of the socio-economic and living conditions of PRS

Methodology
• Poverty is measured using:
  ➢ Money-metric measures (poverty lines): $2.5 /person/day for extreme (abject) poverty line i.e cost of basic food needs and $6.8 /person/day for absolute poverty line i.e cost of minimal food and non-food livelihood requirements
  ➢ Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI): based on measures of deprivation and includes three dimensions: education, health and living standards
Instrument used
- Questionnaire completed through interview conducted during household visit
  - Individual level and household level questions
  - Demographics, education, health, employment, remittances, aid from organizations, housing characteristics, assets, food insecurity and protection

Sample
- Camps and areas outside camps of at least 40 families were included in the sampling frame. This resulted in including all camps except Dbayeh camp and 17 areas outside the camps
- Two-stage systematic cluster (geographical) sampling, which identified 1,177 as total eligible sample
Data Collection

• 65 data collectors, 11 supervisors and 5 field coordinators participated

• Four-day training was held 23 to 27 March by AUB with one day pilot

• Data collection was in April 2015
Findings

Demographics
- 55% are living inside camps and 45% outside camps
- Average age of PRS population is 26.5 years
- 67% over 18 years are married, 24% are single and 6% are widowed
- Average HH size is 5.6 members
- 24% of HH are headed by women
- 54% are females
- Age Dependency ratio is 66%
Poverty

- **89%** of PRS live in poverty (**35,000** could not meet their basic food and non-food needs)

- **9%** live in extreme poverty (**3,500** could not meet essential food requirements) three times higher than PRL

- Poverty is highest in North and Beqaa and lowest in Beirut

- **8%** are severely multi-dimensionally poor lacking basic capabilities essential for their existence and **65%** are suffering from acute deprivation in health, education and living standards

- **91%** of HH with head of low educational attainment are poor and **12%** are extremely poor

- Average monthly spending per capita is **$140**
**Findings**

**Food Security**

- PRS population is particularly vulnerable to food insecurity. 63.2% are severely food insecure, 31.3% are moderately food insecure and 5.6% are food secure. This is similar to food security profile of Syrian refugees where only 7% of families are food secure in 2015 (VASyr 2015 preliminary data)

- Highest prevalence of food insecurity is in Beqaa

- In order to cope 95% of food insecure families report eating less quantity of food than they usually consume

- Food insecurity is shown to be the result of their recent displacement than the result of intergenerational poverty

- Strong association between unemployment and food insecurity
**Findings**

**Employment**

- Unemployment rate is **52.5%**, with 68% for females and 49% for males. Highest rates are in North and Beqaa.

- Similar to PRL, the private sector employs the largest number of PRS across all regions (83%), followed by the NGO sector (1.5%).

- Majority report exploitative, precarious and insecure working conditions.

- Women are almost 1.5 times less likely to be employed than men but more likely to work in decent work conditions.
Findings

**Education**

- School enrolment is **88.3%** in elementary, **69.6%** in preparatory and **35.8%** in secondary.
- **84.6%** of 6 to 15 years old attend UNRWA schools.
- Enrolment is higher inside camps **93.7%** compared to **82.6%** for outside camps.
- Females are 3X more likely to have never attended school compared to males (9.4% to 3.2%).
Health

• 83% report at least one family member with a chronic illness. Their expenditure is 3X more on medications and 2X on hospitalization.

• 1 in 10 HH have at least one person with a disability.

• PRS are almost completely reliant on UNRWA to cover their health needs, with 99% having no access to health insurance other than the coverage by UNRWA.

• 85% of respondents report poor mental health, strongly associated with reports of feeling worried about not being able to provide for their families and losing their source of income.
Findings

Housing

- **37.4%** of PRS HH reported moving house in the past year; with **15.7%** moving once, **11.6%** twice, and **9.6%** three to five times.
- **46.2%** of PRS HH live in overcrowded conditions with more than 3 people sleeping per room.
- **92.6%** of HH rely on UNRWA assistance as a main source of livelihood.
LCC - CSI revision
Revision of the Coping Strategy Index (CSI)
Background on the CSI

“What do you do when you do not have enough food, and do not have enough money to buy food?”

- Proxy indicator of household food security
- Initially developed in a Kenya Pilot Study
- Measures HH use of coping strategies
Development of the CSI

1. Develop an initial list of coping strategies
2. Explore the list among the affected community → FGDs
3. Not to ask what about strategies not used
4. Not to overlook other strategies
5. Ask for frequencies (30 days and 7 days recall period) → “How often?”
6. Ask about severity → “How severe?”
7. Calculate a composite score

   The higher the score the more food insecure the HH is
## Types of CSI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT-SPECIFIC CSI</th>
<th>REDUCED CSI (RCSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Adapted to local circumstances and practices or location-specific behaviors</td>
<td>- Global strategies based on recurrent behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Based on a 30-day recall period (\rightarrow) representative less accurate</td>
<td>- Based on a 7 days recall period (\rightarrow) more accurate less representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cannot be compared</td>
<td>- Less valuable in identifying the most vulnerable households in a given context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Usage of the CSI

- Monitor short-term impact of an intervention
- Targeting purposes
- Inform timing transition or redesign
- Early warning for food insecurity
- Correlates with food-related indicators, income status, presence/absence of malnourished child in the HH and others
Objectives of the Research

- Context-specific CSI has not been updated or reviewed since its original development
- No clear and detailed documentation of the adaptation process
- Coping strategies might have differed across time, as it was previously shown that coping strategies vary according to circumstances
- No calculation steps
- Contradictory findings in previous studies
- Adding additional dimensions/strategies of coping strategies
  - Social Support (e.g., family members, local support,...)
  - NGO Support (e.g., combination of assistance, income generation)
  - Outdated strategies (e.g., selling house/land)
  - Overlooked strategies (e.g., skipping or delaying rent)
Suggested Methodology

1. Forming the Advisory Committee (AC)
   a. The committee will be the one to delineate the further recommended steps.
   b. The AC will be drive the research based on the AC’s ToR

2. Key informant interviews and FGDs with:
   a. Refugees
   b. Community Focal Points
   c. Key Stakeholders
   d. Donors
   e. LCC Staff
   f. Other relevant key informants

3. A first draft of the CSI list will be developed

4. The first draft will be piloted on a small sample, to test robustness and have an idea on reliability and validity → Preliminary Analysis

5. The CSI survey will be run on a large enough sample, around 800.

6. Conducting analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)
Current Updates

- Research and AC ToR → Signed-off
- First draft of the tools developed
- IRB Proposal developed and to be submitted
Maps of Risks and Resources (MRR)

MoSA
Methodology of Maps of Risks and Resources
Outline

I. Introduction on LHSP
II. Importance of the Maps of Risks and Resources
III. Expected Outcomes
IV. Team Composition
V. Methodology of Maps of Risks and Resources
VI. Challenges
VII. Lessons Learnt and Future Steps
The MoSA jointly with the UNDP launched in 2013 The Lebanon Host Communities Support Project as a comprehensive, coordinated and durable response towards the Syrian Crisis and its implications on the country;

The project aims at:

1. Increase the livelihoods and economic opportunities mainly in the effected areas;
2. Providing basic services (health, education, infrastructure, etc.);
3. Strengthen the capacity of local and national actors to assess and respond to the needs and risks in a community participatory driven approach and conflict sensitive approach;
4. Improve the local level dispute resolution and community security.
Importance of the Maps of Risks and Resources

- Participatory Research Method
- Project identification tool for LHSP
- The Methodology aims at:
  1. Enhancing the dialogue between local community and local authority
  2. Assess and identify the needs and priorities of the local community
  3. Establish a Multi-Sectorial Municipal Action Plan to be owned and used by the municipality
Team Composition

National Coordinator

Central Team

Area Coordinator

Team Leader

SDC Director

Data Entry

Facilitator 1

Facilitator 2
Participants in MRR

- Lebanese from or a resident in the village from before the Syrian crisis;
- Aware of the problems of the village and an expert in one of the sectors;
- Representation of the ministries at local level, specially during focus group discussions;
- Relative representation of all the families, sects and sectors present in the village;
- Representation of youth and women;
- Representation of SDC units at area level;
- Presence of the Mayor, Mokhtar and the municipal council at least during the general meeting and adoption meeting.
MRR Track
Preparation Phase – Day 1

- Meeting with Mayor
- Follow up on logistics
- Village Profile
- Desk Review
- Observation and Quick Interviews
Implementation Phase – Day 2

- Conduct a General meeting with all key representatives
- Discuss Problems and Risks and identify the priorities
- Continue the village profile
Analysis and Solution Proposal Phase – Day 3 & Day 4

- Sectorial Focus Group meetings
- Analyze the problems and propose solutions for each
Data Update and Adoption Phase—Day 5

- Updating data on IM tool and finalization of reports
- General meeting with key representatives of the community for discussion of final MAP and adoption
### Municipal Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مساحة العمل المحلي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الموارد غير متوقعة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحلول المتوقعة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التأثيرات المباشرة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أسباب المشكل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المشكل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المخاطر</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاعات</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الصحي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع البيئي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القطاع الزراعي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

- The timing of MRR implementation was simultaneously with the Municipal elections
- Municipal council and stakeholders in some municipalities lack the expertise
- The objective of MRR at first was not fully accepted by the municipalities
- Representation of all sectors in the village was not always present, thus meetings had to be rescheduled several times
- Working on a tight deadline with a lot of documents to finalize
- Perception of hosting communities in certain villages was negative which required a lot of additional work and delay in implementation
Lessons Learnt and Future Steps

- Close Coordination with MOIM Area Coordinators
- Trainings and capacity building for all municipalities under the 251 vulnerable communities
- Capacity building and additional training for MoSA staff
- More coordination at area level with governmental entities and local partners
- Meeting with the governor and the participating municipalities to set the coordination process on track
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Maps of Risks and Resources

The Lebanon Host Communities Support Project (LHSP) is jointly implemented by the Ministry of Social Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme as part of the national strategy to respond to the impact of the Syria crisis on the local communities.

LHSP provides support to communities characterized by high levels of pre-crisis poverty, high concentrations of Syrian displaced and increased social tensions which are the most affected by the crisis.

LHSP is supported by:

LHSP projects are formulated based on the results of the Maps of Risks and Resources (MRR). The MRR is a participatory conflict-sensitive methodology, which engages the municipalities and the communities in a development dialogue.

251 communities have been mapped using the MRR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akkar</th>
<th>Baalbek-El Hermel</th>
<th>Beirut</th>
<th>Bekaa</th>
<th>El Nabatieh</th>
<th>Mount Lebanon</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caza</strong></td>
<td><strong>Village</strong></td>
<td><strong>Locality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Aandqal</td>
<td>Aandqal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Hrar</td>
<td>Hrar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Joudeit El Qaitaa</td>
<td>Joudeit El Qaitaa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Mhammarat</td>
<td>Mhamma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Michmich Aakkar</td>
<td>Mechmech</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Minyara</td>
<td>Minyara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Ouadi El Jamous</td>
<td>Ouadi El Jamous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>QbRAYaat Aakkar</td>
<td>Qoubayyat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Rahbeh</td>
<td>Rahbe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Tikrit</td>
<td>Takrit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحذف رقم 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>وصف</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| تفاصيل النية المحتملة في البلد 
**النارد** |
| **النارية** |
| **النارية الأولى** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>المشتركة رقم 1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>النارية</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>النارية الأولى</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>النارية الثانية</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>النارية الثالثة</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>النارية الرابعة</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**المؤتمرات وال환حارت المتمثرة** 
- **المؤتمرات الأساسية** 
- **المؤتمرات المتطرفة** 

**النインド��** 
- **النحية** 
- **النحية الأولى** 
- **النحية الثانية** 

**المناوبة** 
- **المناوبة** 
- **المناوبة الأولى** 
- **المناوبة الثانية** 

**الحلول المترتبة** 
- **الحلول** 
- **الحلول الأولى** 
- **الحلول الثانية**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caza</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total Applicants</th>
<th>Total Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>aadyeh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>acharfayeh (beyrouth)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>ain el mraisseh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>bachoura</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>basla el faouqa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>basla el tahla</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>dar el fatwa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>gelawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>gemmaizeh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>hamra (beyrouth)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>hikmeh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>hospital orthodaxe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>hotel dieu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>jsr (beyrouth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>mar elias</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>marfa' (beyrouth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>mazraa (beyrouth)</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>mina el hosn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>msatbeh</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>ouata el msatbeh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>patriarch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>qanatan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates from the field: North eviction updates
• Updates on the eviction of households from **7 ITSs in the North (Minieh)** from the inter-agency coordination in the field

• **239 HH** were evicted and were relocated in **Mhammara, Bebnine and Bhanine** scattered in different sites (around 13)

• Coordination with BAWG/UNHCR on information regarding needs

• The majority of evicted families had reported food as one of their priority needs

• The coordination with FS partners was done at both national and field level
FSS Response to the Eviction:

Bhannine: 117 HHs assisted by DAF

Bebnine and Mahmara:

79 HHs assisted by LRC
WFP communication strategy
FS sector steering committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STRENGTHS:</strong></th>
<th><strong>WEAKNESSES:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to introduce the full concept of Food Security</td>
<td>The stabilisation activities need more information and evidence based data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from just food assistance to food security interventions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the number of partners within the sector</td>
<td>Lack of looking at the aspect of actual capacity of implementation to reach targets even if it is a needs based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Government leadership and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer alignment with national priorities – e.g. new MoA strategy</td>
<td>Coordination across sectors: agriculture livelihood activities duplicated in several sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon specific plan is integrated as part of the 3RP which is not a specific</td>
<td>Issue on humanitarian vs development: lack of defined beneficiaries per type of activities and have all activities benefiting the most vulnerable population (Lebanese and refugees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising facilitated</td>
<td>Lack of multi sector joint analysis to define a commonly agreed mechanism to respond to the needs across different cohorts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>WEAKNESSES:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs based approach introduced for the 2016 LCRP</td>
<td>Lack of participation of local organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of information gaps and solutions to that enhanced</td>
<td>Lack of policy component: production of policy brief, guidelines, recommendation to influence decision maker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of activities to cover for all vulnerable groups affected by the crisis (stabilization focus)</td>
<td>Lack of synergy between the different strategies of the different sectors to support the overall achievement of the LCRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce collaboration between agencies working in the same sector(e.g. FAO and WFP)</td>
<td>Agency driven strategy more than sector driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral systems work at field level</td>
<td>Inter sector referral system needs to be improved (works well at the field level but not well known at national level) Referral system awareness could be improved What happens when a case is referred? How do you know if actions are taken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some activities included in the LCRP do not have a link with the Syrian crisis but respond to pre-crisis development needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two perspectives to look at stabilization:

- at sector level (FS stabilization as per the Food Security definition)
- National level on how LCRP contributes to the overall aim of supporting social stability within Lebanon.

Based on the food security recognized definition, the FS sector considers the stabilization concept by meeting the dietary needs over time:

“To be food secure, a population, household or individual must have access to adequate food at all times. They should not risk losing access to food as a consequence of sudden shocks (e.g. an economic or climatic crisis) or cyclical events (e.g. seasonal food insecurity). The concept of stability can therefore refer to both the availability and access dimensions of food security. “

At the moment, the current humanitarian assistance provided through regular food assistance (e-card, vouchers) contributed to this goal together with agriculture activities looking at increasing food availability.

Stabilization at a second level should consider how each sector activities are contributing to the overall country stabilization looking at supporting all the livelihood vulnerability of the population.
LCRP stabilization - scope and nature:

Criteria to be considered are:

- Type of needs: assistance – capacity building
- Building capacity of institutions to enhance a social security/protection and safety net systems enabling the Government to provide a package of assistance to the vulnerable ones
- Define the severity of the need as criteria for prioritization
1. IM: funds geographical concentration
2. Survey – FSS Outcome 4 Monitoring
3. Micro-Garden technical WG meeting: September 14 TBC
4. FSSWG meeting Field Level – North / Akkar: September 20