2024 MSNA IN LEBANON – METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

Objective of the methodological overview

This methodological overview covers the following:

- **Final overview of the MSNA methodology**: final scope and coverage of the assessment, secondary data sources, ethical considerations and limitation (including deviations from the ToRs);
- **Living standard gaps analysis**: short description and explanation of the framework behind the construction of the sectoral composite indicators (living standard gaps or LSG);
- **Annexes**: further details on the country LSG framework, the identification of the LSG and capacity gaps, the estimation of the overall severity of needs (Multi-Sectoral Needs Index), and the partners that participated to the research cycle.

About REACH

REACH facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT). For more information please visit our website. You can contact us directly at: <geneva@reach-initiative.org> and follow us on Twitter @REACH_info.
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Overview of the Assessment Methodology

General and specific objectives and research questions

General and specific objectives

The 2023 Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) in Lebanon was conducted to analyse the demographics, multisectoral humanitarian needs, service access, and displacement dynamics of Lebanese, migrant, and Palestine Refugees in Lebanon (PRL) populations living in Lebanon, with the aim of contributing to a more targeted and evidence-based humanitarian response. For the third consecutive year, the MSNA was implemented to inform national and sectoral response plans and to feed into the Lebanon Emergency Response Plan (LERP) and Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (LCRP).

Research questions

To achieve this objective, the MSNA sought to answer the following five research questions:

- What is the nature of multi-sectoral humanitarian needs in Lebanon?
- What is the magnitude, scope, and severity of humanitarian needs in specific sectors such as shelter, education, food security, health, livelihood, protection, and WASH (Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene) in Lebanon?
- To what extent do households have cross-cutting needs that span multiple sectors, and which overlapping needs are most prevalent?
- How do the findings vary based on geographic area, population groups (Lebanese HHs, live-in and live-out* Migrant HHs and PRL HHs), and the vulnerability profiles of households, including factors including but not limited to age, gender, and disability?
- To what extent is it feasible to identify trends and variances in humanitarian needs by comparing the findings of the MSNAs conducted in 2021, 2022, and 2023?

* live-in migrants: migrants living with their employer. Live-out migrants: migrants having different housing arrangement
Scope and coverage of the assessment

Groups of population and sampling strategy

The 2023 MSNA assessed the needs of Lebanese households, PRL households, and migrant households exclusively.

REACH collaborated with VASyR (Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian Refugees) to ensure the alignment of all core indicators between both assessments, and out of 310 indicators, 169 were aligned. This alignment enabled meaningful comparisons of findings at various levels, including national, across different population groups, and across different strata.

The MSNA included a cross-sectoral demographic section and Accountability of Affected Populations (AAP) alongside separate sectoral sections for Education, Food Security, Health, Nutrition, Livelihoods, Protection, Shelter, and WASH.

Table 1: Sampling strategy by population group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Sampling Methodology</th>
<th>Confidence Level</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese HHs</td>
<td>2-stage cluster sampling</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+/- 10%</td>
<td>Sample stratified by the 26 districts of Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRL HHs</td>
<td>Stratified random sampling</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+/- 9% at governorate level, 10% at camp level</td>
<td>Surveys distributed proportionally across 12 PRL camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-out Migrant HHs</td>
<td>2-stage cluster sampling</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>+/- 10%</td>
<td>Stratified by population figures across 8 strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in Migrant HHs</td>
<td>Non-probability, cluster sampling</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Targeted gathering hotspots on Sundays, quotas per region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For Lebanese HHs, a 2-stage cluster sampling methodology was used, ensuring statistical representativeness across 26 districts.
- For PRL HHs, stratified random sampling was employed to achieve representativeness at both governorate and camp levels, with a total of 1,157 surveys proportionally distributed across 12 camps.
• For live-out migrant HHs, the methodology was similar to that used for Lebanese HHs, using data from the Migrants Presence Monitoring (MPM) conducted by IOM in May 2023. To increase the precision of findings in densely populated governorates, the geographical strata was redefined according to their relative population size. The new geographical stratification in the 2023 MSNA was as follows:
  o Akkar, Baalbek-El Hermel, and Bekaa governorates are merged into one unique stratum.
  o Beirut is split into two parts: Beirut North and Beirut South.
  o Mount Lebanon is split into two parts: Mount Lebanon North and Mount Lebanon South.

• For live-in Migrant HHs, non-probability sampling targeted migrants during their time off on Sundays, focusing on gathering hotspots. Same as for live-out migrants, the geographical strata were redefined based on live-in migrants’ population density in each governorate. IOM provided a list and locations and population figures for 362 migrant hotspots, which were places where migrants gather, such as markets, churches, and shops. Hotspots with a population size below 6 were excluded from the selection process, leaving hotspots with total population size 8153. From this list, 69 hotspots within each stratum were randomly selected, proportionally to their size. It is important to note that this sampling approach follows a non-probability method, and the resulting findings were considered indicative.

Data collection and geographical coverage

Quantitative data collection took place between the 27th of July and the 6th of September 2024 and covered a total of 6,464 households:

• 3,642 interviews with Lebanese HHs
• 1,157 interviews with PRL HHs
• 884 interviews with live-out migrant HHs
• 781 interviews with live-in migrant HHs

Households were interviewed through structured household level interviews, covering all humanitarian sectors. All surveys were collected in person, except for interviews with live-out migrants in Mount Lebanon South, which – due to lack of access to in-person data collection – were conducted over the phone using a snowballing methodology. For the Lebanese population data collection, access was not granted in several locations: Nabatiyeh, Bint Jbeil, Marjaayoun (in Nabatieh governorate), and the southern suburbs of Beirut (in Baabda district). Therefore, perspectives from those areas could not be not included in the findings. The surveys were conducted on smartphones using the KoBo Collect Android app. Enumerators uploaded the data to the REACH server every day.

The maps with geographical coverage are attached in the annex 6.
Secondary data sources

As part of this assessment, REACH used the below secondary resources:

- **VASyR 2022**: Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees in Lebanon
- Central Administration of Statistics, Lebanon Labour Force Follow-up Survey, 2022
- World-Pop Density Data, 2022
- IOM, Migrant Presence Monitoring, 2023
- Lebanon Palestinian Dialogue Committee, Camp-by-camp data on Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon, 2017
- OCHA, Escalating needs in Lebanon. A 2023 overview.
- Lebanon Economic Monitor, World Bank, 2023
- UNHCR, UNDP, Lebanon Emergency Response Plan 2023

Ethical considerations and limitations

**Ethical considerations**

Within the general approach used by REACH, the ethical implications of data collection and information dissemination were considered and investigated:

- The assessment adapted a “do no harm” approach to data collection by working with sector partners to ensure questions and methodology do not pose a risk of re-traumatization or distress to respondents. Enumerator trainings included sessions on principles related to respondent safeguarding and how to behave with and refer respondents if survivors of violence, including gender-based violence, violence against children or urgent child protection risks, or PSEA, disclose incidents over the course of the research. Enumerators also received training on ensuring questions are asked in a non-intrusive, sensitive manner to mitigate any unintended harm. Additionally, respondents could skip questions or pause/withdraw from the discussion at any point. Specific questions related to disability were designed according to the Washington Group - Short Set of Questions on Disability. In each region of interest.
- REACH also recruited field officers to act as team leaders who were familiar with the area of investigation, to allow for culturally adapted communication with households and local stakeholders. Survey teams were recruited to meet the same criteria.
- Where personal data was collected, it was not shared with external partners and access to the information was restricted within REACH. Any other personally identifiable information was deleted before publication of the datasets.
Limitations and challenges

- **Proxy reporting:** Data on the individual level was reported by proxy by one respondent per household, rather than by the concerned individual household members themselves, and therefore might not accurately reflect lived experiences of individual household members, who also might be more vulnerable.

- **Subset indicators:** Findings related to a subset of the overall population may have a wider margin of error, potentially yielding results with lower precision. Any findings related to subsets are indicated as such throughout the different MSNA outputs.

- **Respondent bias:** Certain indicators may be under or over-reported due to the subjectivity and perceptions of respondents. For instance, respondents might tend to provide what they perceive or believe others, such as employers, to perceive as to be the “right” answers to certain questions (i.e., social desirability bias, social taboo bias, constraint for migrants to report on some vulnerabilities when being surveyed in their employers’ home in their presence, etc.).

- **Limitations of household surveys:**
  - While household-level quantitative surveys seek to provide quantifiable information that can be generalised to represent the population groups of interest, the methodology is not suited to provide in-depth explanations of complex issues. Thus, some questions on “how” or “why” are best suited to be explored through qualitative research methods. Since “households” are the unit of analysis, intra-household dynamics (including for instance intra-household power relations across gender, age, disability) cannot be captured. Users are reminded to supplement and triangulate household-level findings with other data sources. Similarly, community-level indicators, such as GBV indicators, may be biased because those indicators were analysed on an individual level.
  - The methodology used to select HHs could contribute to an under-representation of HHs without a shelter within the assessment.
  - During data collection, high income areas had a disproportionately high non-response rate, resulting in a potential over-representation of low and medium-income HHs in these specific areas.
  - HHs level surveys do not capture the situation directly in health services, nor the geographical uses of health services.
  - The unavailability of data for a specific population group, especially when it is vulnerable and hard-to-reach, does not mean this population group is not present in the country and does not have important needs. Similarly, migrant live-in workers may present significant vulnerabilities which are not presented in the Bulletin due to the lack of representativeness in the data collection methods.

- **Geographic coverage:** National and regional results are not indicative of the situation for the Lebanese population living in El-Nabatiyeh, Bint Jbeil, and Marjaayoun as these districts were not covered by the assessment due to access constraints during the data collection. Additionally, findings are not representative of live-out migrants in Mount Lebanon South where representative findings were not available due to the use of phone interviews with snowball sampling.

- **GPS points:** In Baalbek-El Hermel, South, Dahye and El Nabatiyeh governorates, REACH and partners’ enumerators were not allowed to collect GPS points. Therefore, no control of GPS point locations was possible during the data cleaning for these four governorates, which limited our capacity to geospatially monitor the data collection in these specific areas.
For details regarding the indicators and thresholds used in this analysis, please refer to Annex 2.

Each year, REACH facilitates the collection and analysis of crisis-level data across sectors and population groups through Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNA) to support decision-making by humanitarian actors. MSNAs are conducted within a strong partnership framework at sector and inter-sector level. They are timed in order to inform strategic decision-making milestones along the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC), such as the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP).

**Note:** The MSNA data analysis framework is completely independent from the Joint Inter-Sector Analysis Framework (JIAF). While some of the conceptual elements for the MSNA do come from the JIAF 1.1 (e.g. ‘Living Standards Gap’, indicators, severity categories), the methodology used is different. Furthermore, the JIAF is being developed through an inter-agency group and implemented primarily to produce inter-sectoral PiN (and area-level severity) using different data sources available in-country. Meanwhile, the REACH MSNA analysis method was developed internally by REACH and is implemented primarily using household-level data collected through the MSNA. In line with the research questions, the analysis aims to provide a crisis-wide overview of humanitarian needs and the underlying drivers, that influence access to basic needs and services.

The methodology relies on a two-step aggregation process (see Figure 2):

1. **Aggregation of indicators at the sector level:** Construction of sectoral Living Standard Gaps (LSG), see Annex 3 for further details;

2. **Aggregation of sectoral LSGs into a multi-sectoral composite result:** Multi-Sector Needs Index (MSNI), see Annex 4 for further details.

The key analytical components are:
• **Living Standard Gap (LSG):** signifies a need in a given sector, where the LSG severity score is 3 or higher.

• **Severity:** signifies the “intensity” of needs, using a scale that ranges from 1 (minimal/no gap) to 4 (extreme needs)/4+ (very extreme needs).

• **Magnitude:** corresponds to the overall number or percentage of households in need.

• **The Multi-Sectoral Needs Index (MSNI)** is a measure of the household’s overall severity of humanitarian needs across sectors (expressed on a scale from 1 to 4+), based on the highest severity of sectoral LSG severity scores identified in each household.

The severity scale is based on the type of severity scales that exist in version 1.1 of the Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF), an analytical framework being developed at the global level to improve understanding of the needs of affected populations. This framework measures the gradual deterioration of a household’s situation towards the worst possible humanitarian outcome. While the JIAF severity scale includes 5 classes ranging from 1 (none/minimum) to 5 (catastrophic), for the purpose of this MSNA, only a scale of 1 (none/minimum) to 4 (extreme) is used. The “4+” score (very extreme) is used when the data indicates that the situation could be catastrophic. But the term “catastrophic” is not used in this analysis. This is because the data needed to establish a “catastrophic” score is mainly collected at the area level (e.g. mortality rates or malnutrition prevalence), which is difficult to take into account in an analysis at the household or individual level.

The different levels of severity can be broadly defined as follows:

- **Very extreme (4+):** Indications of total collapse of living standards, with potentially immediately life-threatening outcomes (increased risk of mortality and / or irreversible harm to physical or mental well-being).

- **Extreme (4):** Collapse of living standards. (Risk of) significant harm to physical or mental well-being.

- **Severe (3):** Degrading living standards, with reduced access to / availability of basic goods and services. (Risk of) degrading physical or mental well-being.

- **Stress (2):** Living standards are under stress. Minimal (risk of) impact on physical or mental well-being / stressed physical or mental well-being overall.

- **Minimal (1):** Living standards are acceptable, at a maximum showing some signs of deterioration and / or inadequate access to basic services. No or minimal (risk of) impact on physical or mental well-being.

Based on the severity scale, LSG scores (by sector) are calculated by aggregating indicators by sector. A simple aggregation methodology was identified, based on the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) aggregation approach. For details on the aggregation methodology, please refer to Annex 3.

**The Multi-sectoral Needs Index (MSNI)** is a measure of the overall severity of needs experienced by a household over all sectors (expressed on a scale of 1 to 4/4+), based on the highest LSG severity score for a given sector and identified within each household. The MSNI approaches multi-sectoral needs from an overall perspective. A household is considered in need if any of its sectoral LSG score is 3 or higher. Whether a household has very severe need in a single sector or co-occurring severe needs in several sectors, its final MSNI score will remain the same. While this approach makes sense from a response planning perspective—if a household has an extreme need in a single sector, this may substantiate a humanitarian intervention regardless of the co-occurrence with other sectoral needs—, further analyses are needed to unpack the MSNI and understand these differences in magnitude and severity between households. For details on the MSNI construction, please refer to Annex 4.
In addition to the MSNI, the bulletin includes additional analysis on the overall proportion of households by severity, the overall proportion of households in need by sector (i.e., LSG), and the most common needs profiles (LSG combinations).
Annex 1: Related publications (terms of reference, datasets, dashboards)

All documentation and outputs related to the 2024 MSNA in Lebanon are available on the REACH.

**Resource Center:**
- *Terms of reference:* TOR
- *Datasets:* Lebanese, PRL, and Migrants

Preliminary results and tables are accessible here:
- Analysis tables: Lebanese, PRL, and Migrants
- Dashboard: here
- Factsheets: Lebanese, PRL, and Live-out migrants

All REACH multisectoral outputs can be found here.
# Annex 2: Details on the indicators used for the Living Standards Gaps

**WASH sector:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
<th>Percentage of households having access to an improved water source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households having had access to an improved water source</td>
<td>What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household?</td>
<td>List of water sources</td>
<td>Improved water source on premises</td>
<td>Improved water source within 30 minutes</td>
<td>Improved water source more than 30 minutes return time</td>
<td>Unimproved water source</td>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>No LSG identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households reporting distance to water source</td>
<td>How long does it take to go there, get water, and come back?</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Enough drinking water</td>
<td>Rarely had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>Sometimes had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>Often had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>LSG identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quantity</td>
<td>In the last 30 days, has there been any time when your household did not have enough water for the following needs? In the last 4 weeks, how frequently has there not been as much water to drink as you would like for you or anyone in your household?</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Enough drinking water</td>
<td>Rarely had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>Sometimes had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>Often had not enough amount of drinking water</td>
<td>No LSG identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households with access to functioning sanitation facilities</td>
<td>What kind of toilet facility do members of your household usually use? If yes, how many households in total use this toilet facility, including your own household?</td>
<td>List of types of facilities Number of people sharing the facility</td>
<td>Improved &amp; not shared with people outside the household</td>
<td>Improved &amp; shared with less than 20 people</td>
<td>Improved &amp; shared with more than 20 people</td>
<td>Improved, or improved &amp; shared with more than 50 people</td>
<td>Open defecation</td>
<td>LSG identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Health sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| % of households with at least one individual with an unmet health care need | Was __${ind_name}_ able to obtain primary health care when they felt they needed it?  
Was __${ind_name}_ able to obtain secondary health care health care when they felt they needed it? | Yes/No/DK/PNTA | No health care needs in the household | All health care needs were met | At least one individual with an unmet health care need OR at least one person with health care needs met AND WG-SS disability level 3 / 4 | No health care needs in the household | All health care needs were met |

### Shelter/NFI sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households reporting type of shelter they currently live in % of households reporting enclosure damage / issues % of households by occupancy status</td>
<td>What type of shelter does your household live in?</td>
<td>List of shelter types</td>
<td>Adequate shelter type without damage / enclosure issues, no overcrowding and with safety of tenure</td>
<td>Adequate shelter type with damage / enclosure issues, overcrowding or lack of safety of tenure OR inadequate shelter type without damage / enclosure issues, no overcrowding and with safety of tenure</td>
<td>Inadequate shelter type with damage / enclosure issues, overcrowding or lack of safety of tenure</td>
<td>No shelter / sleeping in the open OR total collapse / shelter too damaged and unsafe for living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| % of households living in a functional domestic space | Is your household living in a functional domestic space, in terms of: cooking sleeping storing food electricity  
What other core NFIs is your household missing, if any? | List | Can do / functional, without any issues for all: cooking sleeping storing food and water electricity | selected cannot do or can do / functional, with issues for 1-2 categories | selected cannot do or can do / functional, with issues for all for 3-4 categories | No shelter / sleeping in the open OR total collapse / shelter too damaged and unsafe for living |
### Education sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>No LSG identified</th>
<th>LSG identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-access to education (non-enrolment and non-attendance) and barriers of access</strong></td>
<td>For the 2022-2023 school year, was [name] enrolled (registered) in school or any early childhood education programme? What type of school/early childhood education programme was <strong>${ind_name}</strong> enrolled in? &quot;While schools were open in the current school year (2022-2023), was the child attending school regularly (i.e, for schools that were open 5 days a week - at least 4 days a week; for schools that were open 4 days a week - at least 3 days a week)?</td>
<td>Yes/ No List of school types Yes/No &quot;All school-aged children enrolled in formal schooling and attending regularly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>At least one school-aged child not enrolled in formal schooling or not attending formal schooling regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of children aged between 6 and 18 y.o. who were able to safely travel to school and learn in safe conditions at the school during the 2022-2023 school year</strong></td>
<td>During the 2022-2023 school year, was <strong>${ind_name}</strong> able to travel safely to school and learn in safe conditions at the school? During the 2022-2023 school year, was <strong>${ind_name}</strong> able to learn in acceptable conditions? (i.e. the learning environment met the basic educational needs of learners)</td>
<td>Yes/ No All children learning in a protected environment and under acceptable learning conditions</td>
<td>At least one child learning under unacceptable learning conditions BUT not selected discrimination, displacement, long disruptions due to strikes as a reason</td>
<td>At least one child learning under unacceptable learning conditions AND selected discrimination, displacement, long disruptions due to strikes as a reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Protection sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of HHs with at least one child (&lt;18) not residing in the HH</td>
<td>Does your HH have any child, son or daughter (&lt;18 years) not currently living in the HH? What are the reasons for why your children/child are/is not living in the household?</td>
<td>No separated children</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>At least one child separated for reasons indicating severe child protection concerns</td>
<td>At least one child separated for reasons indicating very severe child protection concerns*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HHs reporting the presence of children engaged in child labor outside of the home in the past 3 months</td>
<td>During the last 7 days, did ${ind_name} do any of the following activities, even for only one hour? Did <strong>${ind_name}</strong> do any work or help on (his/her) own or the household’s plot, farm, food garden or looked after animals? For example, growing farm produce, harvesting, or feeding, grazing or milking animals? Did <strong>${ind_name}</strong> help in a family business or a relative’s business with or without pay, or run (his/her) own business? Did <strong>${ind_name}</strong> produce or sell articles, handicrafts, clothes, food or agricultural products? Since last 7 day, did <strong>${ind_name}</strong> engage in any other activity in return for income in cash or in kind, even for only one hour? Does the activity/Do these activities require carrying heavy loads? Does the activity/Do these activities require working with dangerous tools such as knives and similar or operating heavy machinery? In the last six months did <strong>${ind_name}</strong> engage in employment outside of the home?</td>
<td>No child working outside the household / no children in the household</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>At least one child working outside the household</td>
<td>At least one child working outside the household in jobs requiring carrying heavy loads or working in dangerous tools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| % HHs with at least one child in child marriage | What is the civil status of ${ind}?
list | No child married in the HH | N/A | N/A | At least one child Married OR Separated OR Divorced OR Engaged OR Widowed | N/A |
| % of HH with all household members having regularized legal residency in Lebanon - only for migrants | Does __${ind_name}__ have regularized legal residency in Lebanon? Did __${ind_name}__ have regularized legal residency in Lebanon at any point in 2022? | All HH members 18+ have regularized legal residency | N/A | "At least one HH member 18+ does not have regularized legal residency" | At least one HH member 18+ does not have regularized legal residency and did not have residency at any time in 2022 | N/A |
| % of HH with at least one HH member without an ID document in their possession | Does every person in your household have an ID document (national ID and/or passport)? | All HH members have ID document in their possession | N/A | "All HH members have ID but it’s not currently in all the members’ possession" | All HH members have ID document in their possession | N/A |

**Food Security sector:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption score</td>
<td>Eat cereals, grains, roots and tubers, including bread or wild roots? Eat any beans / legumes, pulses or nuts? Drink milk or eat other dairy products? Eat meat, fish, or eggs? Eat vegetables or leaves, including all wild vegetables and leaves? Eat fruit, including all wild fruits? Eat oil, fat, or butter?</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
<td>FEWSNET Matrix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coping Strategies Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eat sugar or sugary foods?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat condiments or spices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household had to rely on less preferred and less expensive food to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household had to borrow food or rely on help from a relative or friend to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household had to limit portion size of meals at meal times to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household had to restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household had to reduce number of meals eaten in a day to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 4 weeks (30 days), was there ever no food to eat of any kind in your house because of lack of resources to get food? How often did this happen in the past 4 weeks/30 days?</td>
<td>list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 4 weeks (30 days), did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food? How often did this happen in the past 4 weeks/30 days?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the past 4 weeks (30 days), did you or any household member go a whole day and night without eating anything at all because there was not enough food? How often did this happen in the past 4 weeks/30 days?

Livelihood sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Severity level 1</th>
<th>Severity level 2</th>
<th>Severity level 3</th>
<th>Severity level 4</th>
<th>Severity level 4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCSI / Livelihood coping strategies</td>
<td>Please estimate your household income in ${\text{income_currency}} over the past 30 days from each of the following sources. Please report only income received in the form of money, not items or services. Enter “999” if do not know or prefer not to answer</td>
<td>List of shelter types</td>
<td>No coping strategies reported</td>
<td>At least one “stress” coping strategy, no higher coping strategies reported</td>
<td>At least one “crisis” coping strategy, no higher coping strategies reported</td>
<td>At least one “emergency” coping strategy reported</td>
<td>No coping strategies reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s) of income</td>
<td></td>
<td>list</td>
<td>One or more stable sources of income (year-round or seasonal)</td>
<td>Multiple seasonal / unstable sources of income, no stable source</td>
<td>Only one seasonal / unstable source of income, no stable source</td>
<td>No income or only emergency source(s) of income</td>
<td>One or more stable sources of income (year-round or seasonal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Living Standards Gap – Aggregation

With the exception of the Food Security LSG\(^1\), the final sectoral severity score of a household will always be the maximum severity level reached by the sectoral indicators (or combination of indicators) included in the LSG framework (see Figure 3 below as an example).

**Figure 2: Aggregation of critical indicators into a final LSG score**

\(^1\) It is recommended for calculating the Food Security LSG to use the aggregation method of the FEWSNET Matrix.
Annex 4: Multi-Sectoral Needs Index – Aggregation

The final ‘multi-sectoral severity level’ or Multi-Sector Needs Index (MSNI) is obtained for each household as the maximum severity level the household scored across all sectoral LSGs (see Error! Reference source not found. below):

- MSNI = max (Food Security LSG, Livelihoods LSG, WASH LSG, Health LSG, Education LSG, Protection LSG, SNFI LSG)

Figure 3: Example of MSNI calculation per household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food sec</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>WASH</th>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Etc.</th>
<th>MSNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: List of partners (terms of reference, data, dashboards)

**Funded by:**
- Lebanon Humanitarian Fund
- European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
- Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA)

**In the framework of:**
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

**Data collection partners:**
- Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED)
- Developmental Action Without Borders (Nab’aa)
- International Organisation for Migration (IOM)
Annex 6: Coverage Maps