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**Highlights:**

The overall target involved 3% disabled beneficiaries, including physical and sensory related disabilities.

More than half of the interviewed were not aware of MF’s complaint mechanism.

The majority beneficiaries found the distribution process satisfactory and respectful.

The winterization assistance had a significant impact on the beneficiaries’ heating resources.

Winterization assistance covered rent, food, and health expenses.

3% of beneficiaries reported receiving less than 294 USD or more than 733 USD.

E-card distribution reported to be effective.

1. **Context**

Lebanon is host to approximately 1.3 million Syrian refugees, the greatest per capita number in the world. In addition, Lebanon also hosts 450,000 Palestinian refugees, many living in the country’s 12 refugee camps, and some 20,000 refugees from countries including Iraq, Sudan, and Ethiopia, amongst others. Since the beginning of the Syrian Crisis in 2011, the amount of refugees in Lebanon has exponentially increased in parallel with needs.

2. **Methodology**

Beneficiaries received cash assistance based on their residing location’s elevation from sea level. The objective of the assistance was designed to assist beneficiaries in the harsh winter season. The distribution of the winterization card was held by MFRHSU, and funded by UNHCR. The objective of the survey is to understand the extent Winterization assistance was successful and to collect feedback on the quality of this assistance to feed in future program planning. Data was collected through phone call interviews during the first half of February 2017.

Initially, four groups were calculated in order to ensure representation of Syrian, Syrian disabled, Iraqis and another nationalities (ION), and ION Disabled. The information gathered regarding disability information was insufficient as the sample size proved to be minor, and could not be considered reliable for decision making. The strata were then changed in order to reflect both Syrian refugees, and IONs, resulting in two groups. Additional questions were added in the survey in order to reflect PA’s with disability, and any challenges they might have faced with accessibility and risk.

A stratified sample was taken from the 10,185 that attended the distribution. The sample was calculated with a 95% confidence, and 5% margin of error, resulting in a sample size of 372. Distribution was held from the month of October throughout December, in Aley-Chouifet.
3. Findings

Demographic Data

The survey targeted beneficiaries living in Beirut and Mount Lebanon area. 95% of the Iraqi and other nationality beneficiaries came from Mount Lebanon, with a peak in the number of individuals located in el Meten area. For the Syrian group; 83% came from Mount Lebanon, with 2% from Zahle, West Bekaa, and Saida. The 2% could be attributed to relocation, a commonality.

Male beneficiaries were dominant with respect to nationality as well as location. It is not uncommon for Syrian males to be the head of households and bread winner, leading to the belief males hold more means of communication such as the family phone number. In that manner, males are more likely to register as the principle applicant (PA) of the family file number and more likely to respond to the phone survey questions.
In Beirut and Mount Lebanon, it was observed that the number of individuals residing in the same shelter is greater than the number of the household members. A common coping strategy adopted in order to relieve financial burdens.

**Distribution Feedback**

99% of the respondents reported the distribution process was clear and well organised. The remaining 1% stated that it counted too many stages and the overall distribution process was time-consuming. On a similar note, 99% of the interviewed beneficiaries reported that MF staff was respectful to them during distribution.

7.5% of Interviewed beneficiaries reported the distance between their house and the distribution site represented a main challenge in accessing and locating MF’s site. Predominant in beneficiaries residing in the areas of Chouf, Baabda, Elmetn and Beirut districts. 2% of the beneficiaries shared their opinion on how to improve the distribution process and reported a preference to different distribution site, closer to the vicinity of their living areas.
MF’s distribution site was situated in Choueifat, in the district of Allay approximately ten KM away from Beirut’s city centre. Lack of public transportation in certain areas of Lebanon obligated beneficiaries to rely on more expensive services; such as private transportation or private taxis. On average, interviewed beneficiaries spent 12,370 LBP to reach the distribution site. The amount spent greatly varies depending on the district in which the beneficiaries reside: beneficiaries living in Beirut only paid an average of 8,373 LBP whereas beneficiaries from Kesrwan reported paying three times more, with an average of 26,700 LBP. An odd finding, resulted in the lowest average for beneficiaries residing in Saida, a travel distance of approximately 37 KM away from the distribution site, this may be attributed to the density of public transportation made available.

During distributions, 60% of the respondents waited less than one hour before receiving their cards, however 13% waited more than two hours.
These results may reflect distribution days that suffered large crowds, therefore increasing the waiting time on some occasions. In addition, a number of individuals reportedly arrived prior to their time, or attended during a time MF had faced technical issues with the server.

**Card Use**

On average, the interviewed beneficiaries reside 7 minutes away from the closest ATM. Depending on the area they live in, the distance between the closest ATM machine and the beneficiaries’ house slightly differs but remains short, rarely over 30 minutes. The largest distances are witnessed in the Chouf district where it takes on average 17 minutes for the respondents to reach an ATM machine. The above results are expected given the ATM machine density witnessed in the Beirut area, fewer machines are encountered when away from the city’s center.

Only 3% of respondents described feeling insecure when withdrawing money. Among those who felt insecure, the majority were Syrian or Iraqis noted fear that stemmed from the probability of being robbed, due to transferring a substantial amount of money.
11% of the beneficiaries reported not withdrawing the money themselves. In the vast majority, the money was withdrawn by a member of the immediate family: spouse, husband, brother, sister, children or parents. Only one of the interviewed beneficiary had money withdrawn by a neighbour. 99% of Interviewed beneficiaries reported being notified of the distribution by SMS and the 1% by a friend.

The provision of general information on the cash assistance program and how to use the ATM card is a key component of the card distribution process. Four percent of the respondents faced issues after receiving their ATM card, these beneficiaries acknowledged that they did not know how to withdraw money. Some beneficiaries never used a credit card before arriving to Lebanon and needed further assistance to be able to use it, and one individual reported the ATM was not accessible for the disabled.
94% of reported satisfaction with ATM method, respondents declared being satisfied with the ATM card method. However, 4% of the refugees recognised to prefer to receive Cash than an e-card. This correlated to individuals that reported issues with withdraw, where a minority of beneficiaries are unfamiliar with the use of an ATM card and would rather use cash instead.

**Assistance Provided**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assisted with</th>
<th>147-246 $</th>
<th>247-346 $</th>
<th>347-446 $</th>
<th>447-546 $</th>
<th>547-646 $</th>
<th>647-746 $</th>
<th>747-846 $</th>
<th>847-946 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Other Assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18% of the beneficiaries that received the winterization card stated that they were also receiving other types of cash assistance, mainly the WFP E-card, which covers the families’ nutrition needs.

The winterization card usually includes either four or five uploads, each may contain an amount of 73.5 dollars (110,000 LBP) or 147 dollars (220,000 LBP) depending on if they are receiving MCAP, thus the total amount received should be either 293.3, 366.6, 586.6, or 733.3 USD. 97% of the total amounts range between these forecasted numbers. However, the other 3% that received less than 294 dollars or more than 733 dollars were unexpected outcomes that leave a question mark on the reasons these amounts were received.
Expenditures and Impact

Expenditure focused on three main basic needs: shelter (rent), food, and health. An expected outcome, as 82% of interviewed beneficiaries are not receiving any other type of assistance to cover their basic needs. Followed by repaying debts, a number of beneficiaries stated they owed the house owner rent fees for previous months in addition to credit from local shops.

13% covered winterization essentials while others were for transportation, household items, bills, education, and baby’s needs. As assistance was provided during the end of the year, some families took the opportunity to buy Christmas gifts for their children.

A relationship was found between expenses and prioritization section, where rent and food were the highest priority expenses among the Syrian refugees, and health and fuel for cooking followed.
As rent and food came in the first place with respect to the Iraqis, health was of higher importance compared to Syrian nationality perspectives. Fuel for heating scored very low, despite the objective.

The three main concerns of the Sudanese population were rent, food, and debt payment. Health was of medium prioritization, and surprisingly no other resources were among their financial matters.
Assistance Impact on Living Condition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syrian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winterization card was of great support as 321 out of 372 refugees mentioned that it was of moderate or significant assistance. During phone surveys, the majority of beneficiaries expressed satisfaction in receiving the assistance as it aided in supporting them through winter as well as their vulnerable conditions.

Assistance Impact on Reduction of Financial Burden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syrian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the difficulties refugees face in providing their families with proper income, their financial burdens keep on increasing as time passes away from their country. The card was helpful to the beneficiaries, but wasn’t sufficient to cover their financial needs, as 21 % slightly felt that the amount supported them and few Syrians didn’t find it supportive at all.

Assistance Support Through Winter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syrian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective of the assistance was to aid beneficiaries during the winter season, a positive finding with 318 beneficiaries reporting a moderate impact of support through winter.
The majority of beneficiaries reportedly withdrew the total amount soon after they received the SMS, reported to have assisted them moderately in their financial and overall situation during a period of one to two months. All of the Sudanese believed the assistance would not last over a month, whereas Iraqis were more likely to assume it would last all winter. This reflects the vast difference between each nationalities spending habits, despite findings which indicate both Syrian and Sudanese prioritize rent, with Iraqis prioritizing rent and food equally. Finding indicate Syrians were less likely to assume assistance would be sufficient for a month or less.

The beneficiaries did not face any risk by receiving the assistance, however few had some complications with the landlord for rent related reasons.

The assistance had multiple impacts on resource supply, thus allowing most refugees to have a warmer winter, less debts, better health conditions, and mostly decreased their financial burden. In the expenditure analysis, it was noticed that 319 answers were related to winterization assistance, and when comparing the results with the changes experience, 72% were able to achieve the card’s main objectives. This reported change raised a few questions as reported expenses for fuel for heating, was slightly over 15%.

Out of the overall beneficiaries, a minority of one individual faced an issue with limitation of previous donations received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred method of communication</th>
<th>Phone Call</th>
<th>SMS</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Whatsapp</th>
<th>Viber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The beneficiaries were informed about the distribution by an SMS that included the location of the distribution site.
63% of the respondents were satisfied with this method, as it meant they could be aware of the information despite being away from their telephone for long periods of time. Syrians and Iraqis, familiar with the Arabic language understood the SMS message, however, not all Sudanese are fluent in Arabic and therefore preferred the phone call to any other mean of communication.

**Complaint Mechanism**

To increase any NGO’s accountability, the existence of a proper complaint mechanism is of primary importance. MF has several channels for referrals and complaints; these channels include but are not limited to Facebook, E-mail, hotline and Website. 58% of the beneficiaries are not aware that the following mechanisms are established, thus the inability to express any concern. Of those aware of the complaint procedure, 8% were not satisfied with the channels due to low rates of response from the organization’s end. This percentage could decrease if the refugees were aware of the other complaint channels MF initiated. Furthermore, the hotline working hours could be specified on the “important contacts” card according to the availability of the focal point.

**Lessons Learnt**

- Information sharing with affected population should consider the possibility not all refugees are fluent in Arabic.
- Re-emphasizing complaint channels to affected population in order to ensure they are aware of their right to complain, optimally during distribution. Additionally, MFRHSU could add a complaint box at the site.
- Distribution sites should vary depending on residing beneficiaries, perhaps one more distribution site located further into ML in order to be accessible to areas dense in beneficiaries.
- Information sessions on the use of ATM should consider illiterate population.