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OBJECTIVE

Provide an overview of the vulnerability situation of Syrian refugees in Lebanon
METHODOLOGY

POPULATION

UNHCR registered Syrian refugees
Included and excluded for assistance.

Reference Population: ~1.05m (April 2016)

SAMPLING FRAME

Caza level – 26 districts
+ additional 2 districts in Beirut
+ additional 2 districts in Akkar

SAMPLE SIZE

4,950 HH (Visited ~4,500)

preliminary results using 4,019 District Level

HH / Caza = 165 HH

Clusters / Caza = 30

HH / Cluster = 6

based on parameters:
Prevalence: 50%  Precision: 10%  Design effect: 1.5  Non-valid: 5%
METHODOLOGY

QUESTIONNAIRE
Household level:
Based on VASyR & Targeting questionnaire
Focus Group Discussions
Height for Weight data collection

SAMPLING FRAME
Caza level – 26 districts
+ additional 2 districts in Beirut
+ additional 2 districts in Akkar

DATA COLLECTION
23th May – 3th June
Mobile devices – ODK
Data Collection: UNHCR and partners, UNICEF, WFP, LCC
InfoPro conducted Focus Group Discussions
CHALLENGES AND WAY FORWARD

Challenges

Security situation
Access: Hasbaya
Approaching Ramadan

Steps Forward

Core in depth Analysis
Reporting and editing
Graphic design
Publishing
More Comprehensive Analysis to be available by September/October 2016
Additional analysis including cross sectoral indicators will be provided based on Sector’s and partners’ input
Preliminary findings are subject to change and included some initial variables
Demographics

**GENERAL POPULATION**

**MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE** 5.08 ↓ (2015: 5.3)

**AVERAGE CHILDREN PER HH** 2.69

**SEX RATIO (FEMALE/MALE)** 1.05 ↓ (2015: 1.30)

SIGNIFICANT DECREASE IN THE RATIO FEMALE/MALE
Demographics

Age Pyramid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Brackets</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0-4]</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5-9]</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10-14]</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15-19]</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20-24]</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25-29]</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30-34]</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35-39]</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40-44]</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45-49]</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50-54]</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55-59]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60-64]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[65-69]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 &amp; above</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

% Population by Age Bracket

| Age Brackets      | Population
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0-4]</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5-9]</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10-14]</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15-19]</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20-24]</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25-29]</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30-34]</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35-39]</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40-44]</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45-49]</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50-54]</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55-59]</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60-64]</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[65-69]</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 &amp; above</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALE | FEMALE
--- | ---
53%  | 60%
52%  | 62%
49%  | 53%
47%  | 66%
48%  | 57%
50%  | 56%
50%  | 50%
50%  | 50%
46%  | 48%
48%  | 46%
50%  | 52%
50%  | 53%
44%  | 47%
40%  | 38%
34%  | 34%
Demographics

Average Household Size by Governorate

NATIONAL MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE 5.08 (2015 : 5.3)

MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN BEIRUT (4.31) IS SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER THAN OTHER GOVERNORATES
Shelter

Type of Housing

42% of refugees live in inadequate shelter

- Apartment/House: 58%
- Substandard building: 24%
- Informal settlement: 18%

REFUGEES STILL LIVE IN THE SAME TYPES OF SHELTER

41% of refugees live in inadequate shelter

- Apartment/House: 59%
- Substandard building: 24%
- Informal settlement: 17.1%
Type of Housing by Governorate

~60% of refugees in Bekka live in inadequate shelter

- Beirut: 33% Apartment/House, 29% Informal settlement, 9% Substandard building
- Mount-Lebanon: 1% Apartment/House, 1% Informal settlement, 9% Substandard building
- North: 25% Substandard building, 25% Informal settlement, 25% Apartment/House
- Akkar: 25% Substandard building, 29% Informal settlement, 29% Apartment/House
- Baalbeck-Hermel: 43% Informal settlement, 46% Substandard building, 41% Apartment/House
- Bekaa: 18% Informal settlement, 42% Substandard building, 41% Apartment/House
- South: 7% Informal settlement, 24% Substandard building, 7% Apartment/House
- Nabatieh: 4% Informal settlement, 15% Substandard building, 4% Apartment/House

© Copyright 2016 UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF. All rights reserved. No part of this presentation in all its property may be used or reproduced in any form without a written permission.
PROTECTION
Protection

58%
28%
20%

Q: Do all household members above 15 years old have regularized legal residency in Lebanon?

ONLY 20% HAVE VALID RESIDENCY PERMITS.
Protection

% Households with all members without residency by governorate

- Bekaa: 94%
- Baalbeck-Hermel: 94%
- Akkar: 90%
- Mount-Lebanon: 80%
- South: 74%
- Nabatieh: 66%
- Beirut: 58%
- North: 57%
Health

Access to Primary Health Care

Total Population

52.8%

47.2%
Needed Access to PHC in the Last 6 months

People Accessing Care

83%

17%
Assistance over the past 3 months (Self Reported)

Population Receiving Assistance

72% Received Assistance Over last 3 months
28% No Assistance

Comparison
% Population receiving Food, Winter Assistance & Cash

- Food Vouchers: 51%
- Winter Cash: 35%
- Regular Cash: 11%
Assistance over the past 3 months

- 28% Received No Assistance
- 28% Received Two Kinds of assistance
- 11% Received Three Kinds
- 7% Received Four or more Types
- 26% Received one Kind of assistance
Food Consumption Score

- Increase of 5.7% in the Poor Food Consumption Score
- Overall deterioration in the Food Consumption Score
Food Consumption Score by District

Highest % of Poor FCS 2016: Marjeyoun < Sour < Baabda < Nabatieh - Akkar

Highest % of Poor FCS 2015: El Koura < Zagharta < Chouf < Zahle – Tripoli
Overall decrease in the food groups consumed between 2015 and 2016:
- Decrease in the HDADD from 6.4 to 5.6
- Decrease in the HWDD from 9.4 to 8.1

**HWDD 2016:** Sour < Marjeyoun < Zgharta < Akkar < Nabatiyeh < Chouf

**HWDD 2015:** Akkar < Zagharta < El Koura < El Mineh-Dennie < Chouf
Expenditure share

2016:
- Food: 44.6%
- Rent: 17.5%
- Education: 12.0%
- Others: 0.8%

2015:
- Food: 45%
- Rent: 19%
- Education: 1%

Slight Change in the Expenditure amount and Expenditure Share

2016:
- Expenditure share:
  - Food: 459$/ HH/ month
  - Rent: 106$/ pc / month

2015:
- Expenditure share:
  - Food: 493$/ HH / month
  - Rent: 107$/ pc / month
% Population living below Poverty Line: 70.5% (2015: 69.5%)

% Population living below SMEB: 52.2% (2015: 51.5%)
Minimum Expenditure Basket 2016

Slight change in the S/MEB and the poverty line
• Increase by 1% of HH living under the PVL
• Increase by around 1% in HH living below SMEB

- < SMEB (87$)
- SMEB-MEB (87-113$)
- MEB- 125% MEB (114 - 142$)
- >=125% MEB (>=143$)
- Below poverty line <3.84
HH are employing more asset depletion coping strategies

- 11% increase in HH reducing their food expenditures
- 7% increase in HH buying food on credit
- 4% increase in households selling their houses/land in Syria
In comparison to 2015, HH are shifting towards the moderately food insecure category, in line with the FCS.

Food Expenditure share categories remain relatively the same between 2015 and 2016, in line with the expenditure average.

HH are employing more emergency and crisis coping strategies as compared to 2015.
## Food Security Indicators

### Food Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mild Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Moderate Food Insecurity</th>
<th>Severe Food Insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable with coping strategies</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Exp. Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt; 50%</th>
<th>&gt;=50-65%</th>
<th>&gt;=65-75%</th>
<th>&gt;=75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HH not adopting coping strategies</th>
<th>Stress coping strategies</th>
<th>Crisis coping strategies</th>
<th>Emergencies coping strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8% ≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose was to have an updated estimates of the malnutrition status of Syrian refugee children in Lebanon.

Last assessed in 2013, the objective was also to try to see also trends
Through the VASYR 2016 survey, the following variables were collected for all children between 6-59 months, which are needed to estimate malnutrition indicators:

1. Age in months
2. Sex
3. Weight in KG
4. Height in CMs

**Odema was not recorded for this survey**
The analysis of the data was done through Emergency nutrition Assessment software (ENA).

This also provides specific data quality reports on age, measurement and deviations from expected values, which than flag outlier or implausible cases.

The current estimates are calculated using WHO 2006 standard reference population.

The data exclusion criteria was also based on WHO standards of deviation from reference mean.

The current provided figures are preliminary as some of the flagged cases which are included will further be analyzed.
Data Quality

• Age is required in months (or days) for accurate estimation;
  ✓ Data shows heaping largely due to DOB value of 1/1/2012

• Weight and Height recording with high last digit preference of 0
  ✓ Two times more than the rest of the digits

• 315 flagged cases due to age or weight or height inconsistencies

• Without exclusion of WHO standards flagged cases WHZ SD (1.4) >1.2

• Results are presented with flagged cases been removed as per WHO standard flags.
**VASYR 2016 Results – GAM Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (n = 3290)</th>
<th>Boys (n = 1826)</th>
<th>Girls (n = 1692)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of global malnutrition (&lt;-2 z-score)</td>
<td>76 (2.3%) (1.8 - 2.8 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>49 (2.8%) (2.2 - 3.7 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>24 (1.6%) (1.1 - 2.4 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of moderate malnutrition (&lt;-2 z-score and &gt;=-3 z-score)</td>
<td>50 (1.5%) (1.1 - 1.9 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>30 (1.9%) (1.5 - 2.5 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>14 (.9%) (.3 - 1.5 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of severe malnutrition (&lt;-3 z-score)</td>
<td>26 (0.8%) (0.6 - 1.2 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>16 (0.9%) (0.6 - 1.5 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>11 (0.7%) (0.4 - 1.3 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results are weighted as per VASYR 2016 survey design*

**2013 results with Oedema**
**VASYR 2016 Results – Stunting Summary**

|                          | All  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of stunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;=-2 z-score)</td>
<td>(487) 14.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.6 – 16.0 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stunting (&lt;=-2 z-score</td>
<td>(319) 9.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and &gt;=-3 z-score)</td>
<td>(8.8 - 10.7 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of severe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stunting (&lt;=-3 z-score)</td>
<td>(129) 5.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.4 – 5.9 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          | Boys n = 1750 |
| Prevalence of stunting   | (263) 15.0 % |
| (<=-2 z-score)           | (13.4 – 16.7 95% C.I.) |
| Prevalence of moderate   | (170) 9.7 % |
| stunting (<=-2 z-score   | (8.5 – 11.1 95% C.I.) |
| and >=-3 z-score)        |               |
| Prevalence of severe     | (93) 5.3 % |
| stunting (<=-3 z-score)  | (4.3 – 6.4 95% C.I.) |

|                          | Girls n = 1541 |
| Prevalence of stunting   | (223) 14.5 % |
| (<=-2 z-score)           | (12.8 – 16.3 95% C.I.) |
| Prevalence of moderate   | (146) 8.6 % |
| stunting (<=-2 z-score   | (7.4 – 10.1 95% C.I.) |
| and >=-3 z-score)        |               |
| Prevalence of severe     | (76) 4.9 % |
| stunting (<=-3 z-score)  | (3.9 – 6.1 95% C.I.) |

Results are weighted as per VASYR 2016 survey design
## Nutrition module

### VASYR 2016 Results – Underweight Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All (n = 3396)</th>
<th>Boys (n = 1815)</th>
<th>Girls (n = 1580)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of underweight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;-2 z-score)</td>
<td>(146) 4.3 %</td>
<td>(71) 3.9 %</td>
<td>(76) 4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.7 – 5.0 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(3.1 – 4.9 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(3.8 – 5.9 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of moderate underweight</strong></td>
<td>(102) 3.0 %</td>
<td>(44) 2.4 %</td>
<td>(17) 3.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;-2 z-score and &gt;=-3 z-score)</td>
<td>(2.0 - 4.0 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(1.6 – 3.2 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(2.6 - 4.6 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of severe underweight</strong></td>
<td>(44) 1.3 %</td>
<td>(27) 1.5 %</td>
<td>(17) 1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt;-3 z-score)</td>
<td>(1 - 1.7 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(1.1 - 2.2 95% C.I.)</td>
<td>(0.7 – 1.7 95% C.I.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are weighted as per VASYR 2016 survey design.
Nutrition module

Conclusion

• The current trend for GAM for Syrian children 6-59 months seems to be stable at around 2%, with the similar trend of boys being slightly wasted more than girls (2.8% vs 1.6%).

• Stunting prevalence remains low, though seems to have slightly decreased from overall 19% to 15%.

• Underweight also remains low, but has slightly increased from 2.6% to 4.3%. The underweight prevalence for girls is slightly larger for girls than boys.
WAY FORWARD

• Core in depth Analysis
• Reporting and editing
• Graphic design
• Publishing
• More Comprehensive Analysis to be available by September/October 2016
• Additional analysis including cross sectoral indicators will be provided based on Sector’s and partners’ input
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