1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The Whole of Syria Food Security Sector (FSS), initiated an outcome monitoring exercise in 2016, to report at outcome level on core food security indicators in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP). Following its successful implementation with 17 partners, in HRP 2017 the outcome monitoring initiative is included to provide evidence required to adjust FSS activities and inform on gaps. This initiative is conducted through a common Post Distribution Monitoring tool among sector partners to follow-up on the effects of various food security and livelihood activities implemented by partners across Syria from all Whole of Syria (WoS) hubs. In this round, 22 partners participated in data collection – WFP, 10 International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and 11 Syrian Non-Governmental Organization (SNGOs). The Nutrition Sector also contributed to the initiative by training FSS partners on anthropometric measurements for children under 5.

Specific Objectives

- Monitor the effects of food and livelihood assistance activities implemented by FSS partners in Syria;
- Provide analysis of food and livelihood indicators to inform the design and implementation of FSS activities;
- Identify gaps and areas of concern based on evidence from primary data collection;
- Enhance monitoring and analysis of livelihood, food security indicators by partners, using common tools and indicators.

This round of data collection was conducted at the peak of the lean season when households were having difficulties in accessing food, particularly the most vulnerable population groups affected by the current conflict Syria, including the newly displaced households. Findings from this analysis are compared to the 2016 first round assessment period. It should be noted that since this was a post-harvest period, some differences on food consumption patterns and household coping behaviours are expected.
2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Whole of Syria Food Security Sector (FSS), with support from partners conducted the second round of the Outcome Monitoring Initiative in May 2017, surveying 10,390 households in 14 governorates. In this round, support was provided by the Technical Working Group[^1^] (TWG) and 22 partners that are operating in Syria from the three formal hubs in Amman, Jordan, Damascus – Syria, Gaziantep – Turkey, and two informal hubs.

- Findings indicate a deterioration of food consumption patterns of surveyed households compared to the first round of outcome monitoring conducted in the last quarter of 2016, as shown by an increase in percentage of households with poor food consumption from 11 percent to 19 percent. This is also recorded for both male and female headed households, from 10 to 25 percent and 11 to 18 percent respectively.

- A high proportion of households with poor food consumption was reported in collective shelters (27 percent) and camps (39 percent).

- A majority of the households had access to vitamin A and protein rich food items for at least one day in a week. 54 percent of interviewed households were consuming Vitamin A rich food on a daily basis, 62 percent were consuming protein rich food on a daily basis. This was different for consumption of hem iron, which was never consumed by 65 percent of the households.

- The Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS), indicates a decrease of 20 percentage points (as compared to the OMI conducted in 2016) in the proportion of households with a “good” diet, those that were consuming at least six food groups. This was also reflected in dietary diversity of both male and female headed households.

- Purchases using cash remain the main source of food, contributing a 56 percentage share, followed by a 20 percent from humanitarian assistance and 16 percent from credits. Food from households’ own production contributed only 5 percent of consumed food items.

- High reduced coping strategy index (rCSI – that indicates how households cope to access food) values were recorded in Rural Damascus, Lattakia, Der-ez-Zor and Ar-Raqqa indicating a worse food security situation among interviewed households in these areas.

- The percentage of households that relied on emergency coping strategies (severe, extreme behaviours that affected future productivity) increased by 14 percent when compared to the first round.

[^1^] Outcome monitoring technical working group members: WFP, FAO, UNRWA and RFSAN
• Displaced households are worse off for all the indicators that were monitored - 22 percent in poor food consumption group, 27 percent with low dietary diversity, 40 percent applying emergency livelihood coping strategies.

3. MEASUREMENT

The second round of outcome monitoring (OMI-R2) enabled analysis of food consumption patterns and household coping capacities. Selected indicators include the food consumption score, household dietary diversity, food consumption and livelihood based coping strategies. The measurement of anthropometric data was also included in some locations, as a pilot and capacity building initiative for partners, in preparation for future assessments that may require integration of nutrition indicators.
4. METHODOLOGY

The methodology applied in OMI-R2 was informed by recommendations from consultations that were held with partners during the pilot phase, mainly on sampling of the households, increasing coverage to all accessible locations and enhancing data management systems during data collection. In this round, a data collection period was defined for all partners to conduct household interviews, in May 2017.

4.1 SAMPLING OF HOUSEHOLDS

The sampling plan for the OMI-R2 followed a two-step process to determine the minimum sample size per sub district. These two sampling steps are explained in Annex III. The sampling process was designed to interview a minimum of 68 households per sub district, as this sample will provide a representative number of households at 10 percent margin of error, 90% confidence level. Partners were encouraged to interview additional households if resources permitted, in order to increase the sample size. The plan was to interview 12,700 households in May 2017 out of which 10,390 households were the actual number of households visited for interviews.

4.2 TRAINING OF PARTNERS

Enumerators were trained by the Food Security Sector-Technical Working Group on food security concepts, random selection of households and how to conduct household interviews. Twenty two partners attended the training sessions in the three formal hubs – Damascus (Syria), Gaziantep
(Turkey) and Amman (Jordan). Two training sessions were also conducted for partners operating in North East Syria. Some enumerators from 15 partners were trained on the measurement of basic nutrition indicators, including how to collect anthropometric datasets (weight, height, MUAC measurements).

**4.3 DATA MANAGEMENT**

A mobile data collection platform was developed and utilized for data submission of household interviews from partners using a central server for storage of the dataset. This ensured auto-validation of responses during data collection, and timely follow-up with partners on any observations regarding the quality of submitted datasets. Some partners conducted households’ interviews using paper questionnaires, mostly in areas that were considered to be contextually difficult to conduct household interviews using the mobile data collection platform.

**4.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

The data analysis was coordinated by the FSS-technical working group. The process was also validated through consultation meetings that were held at hub level, attended by all partners in the three hubs. Partners were trained on how to conduct analysis of outcome indicators for their own operational needs.
5. OUTCOME MONITORING INITIATIVE, SECOND ROUND (OMI-R2) FINDINGS

5.1: DATA COLLECTION COVERAGE
10,390 households (82 percent of the plan) were interviewed in 14 governorates, in areas that received humanitarian assistance through various FSS activities. Data collection was conducted in May 2017 in 10 governorates, while one partner operating in four governorates (Damascus, Lattakia, Sweida, Tartous) conducted post distribution surveys over a period of three months (March, April, May), to suit the partner’s monitoring strategy. Figure 1 below shows the areas and the number of households that were visited by enumerators for data collection:

**FIGURE 1: AREAS SURVEYED, 2ND ROUND OF OUTCOME MONITORING INITIATIVE**
The number of locations visited and households interviewed increased in Der-ez-Zor and Raqqa in this round, since some partners had access to conduct face-to-face interviews than during the pilot round in 2016. However, the overall number of households interviewed in this round are 18 percent below the planned sample of 12,700 and 11 percent below 2016 pilot, due to below reasons:

- Less household interviews in Damascus, Lattakia, As-Sweida and Tartous governorates due to challenges in getting approvals for data collection.
- Worsening security situation in some sub districts in Daraa, Quneitra, Idleb resulted in cancellation of monitoring visits.
- Conflict in Dier-ez-Zor and Raqqa governorates.
- Some partners could not conduct household interviews due to changes in operational and monitoring plans.

Figure 2 below shows the number of households interviewed in each governorate compared to the pilot.

**FIGURE 2: NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS INTERVIEWED IN EACH GOVERNORATE**

![Bar chart showing the number of households interviewed in each governorate in 2017 and 2016](chart.png)

*not representative sample size

\*no text content in the diagram\*
The analysis in this report is representative at governorate level in ten governorates where sample size is large enough to have results that inform on the food security situation of assisted households. In four governorates (As-Sweida, Damascus, Lattakia and Tartous), the sample of interviewed households is small to be representative of all households assisted through FSS activities in these governorates, therefore analysis of indicators in these governorates only provides an indication of the food security situation.

5.2 DEMOGRAPHICS

Outcome monitoring findings from the OMI-R2 indicate that households targeted through various food and livelihood activities include some of the most vulnerable groups in the food security sector recommended targeting criteria including the following:

- Households headed by chronically ill or disabled persons (~10 percent),
- 23 percent had a chronically ill member
- 18 percent had at least one household member who had some form of disability and
- Female headed households account for 14 percent of those interviewed.

![Figure 3: Percentage of Vulnerable Households by Demographics Status](image)

About forty four (44) percent of the surveyed households were displaced, while 41 percent were never displaced and 15 percent had returned after being displaced due to the conflict. A small percentage (0.3 percent) were from refugees households, interviewed in some governorates-Al-Hasakeh, Daraa, Rural Damascus, Homs, Aleppo and Idleb.

[2] Representative parameters for a sample size of 68 households: 10 percent margin of error, 90% confidence level

The majority of the displaced households were either living in rented accommodation (~38%) or hosted by family and/or friends (~26%). Returnees and households from the host community were mainly residing in owned houses. About 9 percent and 13 percent of displaced and refugee households respectively, indicated that they were staying in camps.

5.3 HOUSEHOLD FOOD CONSUMPTION PATTERNS

Food Consumption Score (FCS) [4]

The FCS indicator measures dietary diversity, food frequency and relative nutritional importance of different food groups consumed at the household level, over a recall period of one week. Eight food groups were monitored, and the analysis resulted in classification of households into three food consumption groups: poor, borderline, and acceptable consumption, using the adjusted thresholds [5] of the FCS (0 - 28: Poor; >28 – 42, borderline and > 42: Acceptable). Table 1 below shows the eight food groups, weights of each food group and justification for the weight:


[5] Due high consumption oil and sugar (consumed on daily basis)
Food Consumption Score Nutritional Quality Analysis (FCS-N) was also used to analyse household access to Vitamin A, Protein and Hem Iron rich food items. Analysis shows worsening food consumption patterns compared to the first round. The proportion of households with poor food consumption increased by 8 percentage points (from 11% to 19%). This could be attributed to the seasonal variation in access and availability of food between the lean season and post-harvest period. This also contributed to the increase in the proportion of households with poor or borderline food consumption, a group which is usually considered a population of concern. Figure 5 below shows the food consumption groups of households interviewed in the OMI-R2 when compared to the 1st round.

**Table 1: Food Groups Monitored for Calculation of FCS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Groups</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereals and tubers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Energy dense, protein content lower and poorer quality, than legumes, micro-nutrients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Energy dense, high amounts of protein but of lower quality than meats, micro-nutrients, low fat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low energy, low protein, no fat, micro-nutrients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low energy, low protein, no fat, micro-nutrients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and fish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest quality protein, easily absorbable micro-nutrients, energy dense, fat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest quality protein, micro-nutrients, vitamin A, energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Empty calories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Energy dense but usually no other micro-nutrients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Consumption Score Nutritional Quality Analysis (FCS-N) was also used to analyse household access to Vitamin A, Protein and Hem Iron rich food items.

Analysis shows worsening food consumption patterns compared to the first round. The proportion of households with poor food consumption increased by 8 percentage points (from 11% to 19%). This could be attributed to the seasonal variation in access and availability of food between the lean season and post-harvest period. This also contributed to the increase in the proportion of households with poor or borderline food consumption, a group which is usually considered a population of concern. Figure 5 below shows the food consumption groups of households interviewed in the OMI-R2 when compared to the 1st round.

**Figure 5: Percentage of Households Food Consumption Group 1st Round Compared to 2nd Round**

![Figure 5: Percentage of Households Food Consumption Group 1st Round Compared to 2nd Round](https://www.wfp.org/content/food-consumption-score-nutritional-quality-analysis-fcs-n-technical-guidance-note)

5.3.1 FOOD CONSUMPTION BY GOVERNORATE

Analysis of food consumption patterns at the governorate level indicates a geographic variation in the proportion of households with poor and borderline food consumption. Six governorates recorded a high proportion of households in the poor food consumption group, mainly due to low consumption frequency of nutrition rich food items—dairy products, meat and vegetables.

• About 55 percent of households that were interviewed in Quneitra had poor or borderline food consumption. Information from partners operating in Quneitra governorate also confirmed challenges that were encountered in the first months of 2017 on humanitarian access due to intensification of conflict and then later on administrative restrictions, this hindered the delivery of humanitarian assistance to certain sub districts in Queitra.

• In Al-Hasakeh, analysis of operational achievement through food basket distribution indicates that the number of beneficiaries reached in the first half of 2017 against the people in need—PIN (as per 2017, HNO figures) ranges from 4 to 64 percent as shown in figure 7 below. The low achievement in food basket distribution in some of these sub districts could be the main reason for the high proportion of households that had poor and borderline food consumption in this round of outcome monitoring. This is despite efforts by humanitarian organizations to reach vulnerable households in the governorate, including WFP’s airlifts that were launched in July 2016. [7]

[7] Due high consumption oil aWFP stopped airlifts to Qamishli in Syria’s northeastern Al-Hasakeh governorate, in June 2017 following the reopening of the land corridor to the governorate. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/wfp292554.pdf

sugar (consumed on daily basis)
• In Idleb governorate, worsening security situation due to military confrontations between armed groups contributed to an increase in the number of displaced people during the reporting period, the majority of which had lost their sources of livelihood and food.

• Households residing in sub districts that are located near besieged locations in Rural Damascus had limited access to markets, hence contributed to the deterioration in their food consumption patterns.

• In Der-ez-Zor governorate the analysis indicates a high proportion of households with acceptable food consumption, mainly due to high frequency in consumption of dairy products, which is linked to the presence of livestock during this period. Debriefing meetings held with data collection teams indicates that households in surveyed areas had access to food from market purchases and some from their own production in April/May, indicating consumption of early harvested crops. In May, households in these areas also benefited from a decrease in staple food prices, by more than 50 percent when compared to the beginning of the year (mVAM May 2017, Report). However, the food security situation could be worse in the besieged areas of Der-Ez-Zor city where households have limited access to food. Humanitarian organizations, including WFP’s airdrop operation continue to provide life-saving support to the most vulnerable households in the besieged city.

• In Ar-Raqqa governorate, the analysis indicate that the consumption frequency of dairy products (an average of 6 days per week), contributed to the high proportion of households with acceptable food consumption (see annex I with summary of average consumption frequency of various per governorate food groups monitored).

Note: The food security situation in Der-ez-Zor and Ar-Raqqa governorates is expected to have worsened after May 2017 data collection due to the intensification of the military offensive that resulted in increased displacements, movement of people to IDP camps and host communities either within or outside the governorates, thereby limiting household access to food and usual livelihood sources. Rapid assessment and monitoring conducted by partners already indicates a decrease in access to food from own production and also through market purchases. In Ar-Raqqa governorate, increase in prices of basic food commodities was also reported in July and some commodities were no longer available in the market after the launch of the offensive aiming at taking control of the Ar-Raqqa city.

[8] Note: data collection was not conducted in the besieged areas of Dier Der-Ez-Zor governorate.


There is an increase in the proportion of both male and female headed households with poor or borderline food consumption when compared to the first round. This could be attributed to the difficulties that households encountered in accessing food during the lean season. The 10 percentage point difference between male and female headed households with poor or borderline food consumption suggests that the latter are more vulnerable to food insecurity.
5.3.3 FOOD CONSUMPTION OF RESIDENT, RETURNEE, DISPLACED AND REFUGEE HOUSEHOLDS

Nearly half of the displaced households had poor or borderline food consumption, which is greater than the proportion of residents and returnees in the same food consumption groups. This also suggests that IDPs and refugees remain highly vulnerable to food insecurity.

5.3.4 FOOD CONSUMPTION BY ACCOMMODATION STATUS

More than half the households that were interviewed in camps and collective shelters had poor or borderline food consumption, these mainly comprised of displaced and refugee households. About 60 percent of households surveyed in owned or rented houses had acceptable food consumption, suggesting better food consumption when compared to those in camps and collective shelter.
5.4 FOOD CONSUMPTION FREQUENCY

The overall food frequency analysis shows high consumption of staples (cereals and tubers), at an average of six days a week, and five days for sugar and oil. Other nutrition-rich food items were consumed less frequently in a recall period of seven days.

Households with poor food consumption (~19 percent of interviewed households) had less consumption of all the food groups, when compared to those in the borderline and acceptable categories. Pulses, dairy products, and vegetables were being consumed only one day per week, while zero consumption days were recorded for meat and fruits.

Households in the acceptable food consumption category (~58 percent of interviewed households) had a high frequency in the consumption of staples, dairy products, oil and fats. However, they also recorded low consumption of fruits and pulses, as shown in Figure 11 below:

Disaggregation of results by accommodation type shows (Figure 12) high consumption frequency of nutrition-rich food groups (dairy, vegetables, meat) among households that live in their own properties when compared to those living in camps. This could be an indication that those who own houses have additional resources available to purchase additional food items to complement what is distributed by humanitarian agencies. Vulnerable households in camps (mainly the displaced families), had low consumption frequency of commodities that are not included in the humanitarian basket, including meat, dairy product.
5.4.1 CONSUMPTION OF VITAMIN A, PROTEIN AND HEM IRON RICH FOOD GROUPS

Seventy percent of surveyed households were interviewed regarding their access to vitamin A, protein and hem iron rich food. The analysis indicates nutritional deficiency on household’s access to hem iron which is a key nutrient required for a healthy and nutritious diet. About 65 percent of the interviewed households had limited access to hem iron rich food items, (such as meat and fish products). Vitamin A and protein-rich food items were accessible by the majority of the households, mainly from assistance distributed by humanitarian partners.

Consumption of vitamin A, protein and hem iron rich food items also varies by food consumption groups. About 21 percent of households with poor food consumption were noted to have limited consumption of Vitamin A, which is higher compared to the 5 percent for households with borderline food consumption. The same trend is also observed for the consumption of protein rich food items, thus indicating that households with poor food consumption are likely to not be consuming enough to meet their nutritional requirements. Consumption of hem iron was low for all the food consumption groups as shown in figure 14.
5.5 HOUSEHOLD DIETARY DIVERSITY SCORE

Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)\textsuperscript{[11]}

Even among households who satisfy their calorie requirements, those who consume a non-diversified, unbalanced and unhealthy diet, can be classified as food insecure. Food insecure households tend to spend a larger share, if not all of their food budget on macronutrient dense staples, which provide cheap and accessible sources of calories. In doing so, they compromise more nutritious items and as a result their diet lacks adequate proteins and micro-nutrients. The Household Diet Diversity Score was included in the outcome monitoring to measure how many food groups were consumed.

The percentage of households with good dietary diversity (consuming 6 or more food groups), has decreased from 52 percent in the first round to 32 percent. This has also resulted in a corresponding 10 percent increase in the proportion of households with low dietary diversity compared to the first round, indicating the difficulties that households face in accessing a variety of food groups.

\textsuperscript{[11]} http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp269531.pdf
About 38 percent of the households in camps were noted to have low dietary diversity, which is much greater than those who owned houses or were residing in rented accommodation. This suggest difficulties by households that are in camps to access a diversified diet.

A difference of 8 percentage points in male and female headed households with low dietary diversity was observed, suggesting that the latter remains vulnerable to food insecurity as they cannot afford an equally diversified diet. There is also a decrease in proportion of households with good “dietary” diversity- those consuming at least 6 food groups- as shows in Figure 17 below:
5.6 HOUSEHOLD FOOD SOURCES

Cash purchases remain the main source of food for the majority of households surveyed. They account for 56 percent of food items consumed, increasing from 47 percent previously. This is an indication that assisted households rely on market for other food items, not provided by humanitarian assistance. Figure 18 below shows that commodities purchased using cash are mainly those that are not included in the food baskets including vegetables, fruits, meat and dairy products.

**FIGURE 18: SOURCES OF FOOD ITEMS CONSUMED BY HOUSEHOLDS**

The analysis also shows that humanitarian assistance and credit purchases are respectively the second and third sources of overall food consumed by households. Cereals, pulses, oil/fats and sugar are the four main commodities that are included in the regular food baskets distributed by partners, and this is also confirmed through this analysis. Access to food from households’ own production only totalled 5 percent share of the overall food items consumed by households, mainly for the dairy products, meat and vegetables.
The same trend is also demonstrated when comparing resident, returnee, displaced and refugee households. Access to food from own production is the only source which shows a notable difference in the population groups, contributing a 7 percent share for both resident and returnees.
5.7 HOUSEHOLD COPING CAPACITY
5.7.1 FOOD CONSUMPTION BASED COPING STRATEGIES (RCSI)

Reduced Coping Strategy Index (CSI)\footnote{http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp211058.pdf}

When livelihoods are negatively affected by a shock or crisis, households may alter their day-to-day life by adopting various mechanisms (strategies) to cope with reduced or declining access to food. The Coping Strategy Index (CSI) is often used as a proxy indicator of household food insecurity. CSI is based on a list of behaviours (coping strategies) and it combines: (i) the frequency of each strategy (how many times each strategy was adopted in a recall period of 7 days); and (ii) their (severity) (how serious is each strategy?) for households reporting food consumption problems. Higher rCSI indicates a worse food security situation and vice versa.

Households were also asked on behaviors taken to mitigate or react to shortfalls in food supply, and this was used in calculating the reduced coping strategy (rCSI). The average rCSI of interviewed households decreased by 3 percent from 15.7 in the first round to 11. in OMI-R2. However, some governorates recorded an increase in the rCSI - Rural Damascus and Al-Hasakeh governorates. Households interviewed in Dier-Ez-Zor and Ar-Raqqa governorates also had high rCSI, indicating that these households were applying the five standard strategies more frequently.

\textbf{FIGURE 21: AVERAGE REDUCED COPING STRATEGY INDEX (RCSI) BY GOVERNORATE}

*not representative sample size
Figure 22 below shows the average frequency of coping behaviours for the four governorates that recorded an increase in the rCSI vs the average for all interviewed households. In all four governorates, households were applying the five coping strategies more frequently than the households interviewed in other governorates. Households interviewed in Der-Ez-Zor cited reducing the number of meals, and consumption of less preferred food items as the frequently applied strategies.

Categorizing households into three groups\(^\text{[13]}\) – low (rCSI of 0 – 4), medium (rCSI: 5 – 20) and high (rCSI > 20) coping shows that Dier-Ez-Zor, Rural Damascus, Ar-Raqqa and Al-Hasakeh governorates had many households in the high coping category. Households in these governorates therefore have a high frequency of applying some of the coping strategies when food supplies are low, and thus indicates their vulnerability to food insecurity.

The rCSI for both female and male headed households also recorded a decrease when compared to the first round (from 16.9 to 13.5 for female headed and 15.6 to 10.7 for male headed households). Comparison between the two groups indicates that there is high percentage of female headed households in the high coping category, compared to male headed households, also indicating later’s vulnerability to food insecurity. Figure 24 below shows comparison of households in each of the coping categories:

**FIGURE 24: HOUSEHOLDS WITH LOW, MEDIUM AND HIGH COPING BY GENDER OF HOUSEHOLDS HEAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Displaced households had a higher rCSI (13.2) when compared to residents (rCSI = 9.8), returnees (rCSI: 10.5) and refugees (rCSI: 11). Figure 25 below also shows that 22 percent of the displaced households were in the high coping category, more than the other groups.

**FIGURE 25: HOUSEHOLDS WITH LOW, MEDIUM AND HIGH COPING FOR IDPS, RESIDENTS, RETURNEEs AND REFUGEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.2 LIVELIHOOD BASED COPING (LCSI)

Livelihood Coping Strategy Index (LCSI)[14]

Livelihood-based coping strategies were also included in the monitoring initiative to better understand longer-term coping capacities of households. Ten livelihood coping strategies were selected through consultation meetings held with partners in 2016. The selected list had 4 stress, 3 crises and 3 emergency livelihood coping strategies:

- Stress strategies: indicate a reduced ability to deal with future shocks due to reduction in resources.
- Crisis strategies: directly reduce future productivity of the households, including human capital formation.
- Emergency Strategies: affect future productivity but are more difficult to reverse, or are more severe or extreme in nature for the household.

### TABLE 2: MONITORED LIVELIHOOD COPING STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th>CRISIS</th>
<th>EMERGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Household Assets (non-productive)</td>
<td>Sale of Productive assets</td>
<td>Children working (less than 16 years old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase food on credit or borrow or share food</td>
<td>Reduce expenditure on non-food essential items (e.g. water, education, health)</td>
<td>Marriage of young girls (less than 16 years old) (in order to ease the financial stress on family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members have taken up alternative or socially degrading jobs</td>
<td>Reduce expenditure on productive assets</td>
<td>Undertake high risk or exploitative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of other humanitarian assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 4,750 households in seven governorates were interviewed on livelihood based coping strategies that were applied in a period of 30 days, prior to the survey. 89 percent of the households had applied at least one of the 10 livelihoods based coping strategies. Comparing the first round and OMI-R2 findings shows an increase in the proportion of households with members that engaged in high risk or exploitative work, by an average of 14 percentage points (from 17 percent to 31 percent). Households with children that were working also increased by two percentage points.

The percentage of households that applied crisis strategies is below what was recorded in the first round, particularly for expenditure on productive assets and sale of productive assets. Reducing expenditure on non-food essential items remains the most commonly applied behavior among the crisis strategies.

There is an indication of a decrease in households that applied stress coping strategies including selling of humanitarian assistance (food and NFIs) from 43 percent to 27 percent. The main reasons for selling humanitarian assistance include replacing with food items of better quality, purchasing cooking gas and paying for other non-food essentials (medicine, transport and kitchen utensils). Purchase of food on credit or borrowing remain the predominant strategy applied by surveyed households.

Findings also indicate a 14 percentage point increase in the proportion of households that had applied emergency coping strategies from 26 percent in the first round to 40 percent in OMI-R2. At least half of the households interviewed in Queintra and Rural Damascus had applied one of the four emergency coping strategies. In Queintra, nearly all households applied one of the ten livelihoods coping behaviors.
Analysis of livelihood based coping strategies by gender of household head shows an increase in the proportion of households that applied emergency coping for both male and female headed households. This is a worrying trend, considering that emergency coping strategies affect future productivity and are difficult to reverse.

Figure 31 indicates that there is no much difference in the proportion of households in each of the livelihood coping categories for displaced, residents and returnees. More than half of the refugees were applying emergency coping strategies.
6. TARGETING

In the 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan, the Food Security Sector provided a recommended targeting criteria,\(^\text{[15]}\) that guides partners when selecting the most food insecure households, based on a number of vulnerability indicators, outcome monitoring findings indicates that assisted household meet some of the selection criteria including the following:

- **Household demographic indicators:**
  - In this round of outcome monitoring, about 10 percent of interviewed households were headed by a chronically ill or disabled household head and
  - 14 percent were female headed

- **Vulnerability status of household members:**
  - About 18 percent of the households had members that had some form of disability that limit their participation in activities that contribute in meeting the food and livelihood needs of the households.
  - 23 percent had a chronically ill household member.

- **Displacement status of the households**
  - 44 percent and 15 percent were from displaced or returnee’s households, respectively.

- **Accommodation status of the household:**
  - About 51 percent of the households could not afford accommodation costs, and were either hosted by other households, staying in collecting shelters, abandoned building or in camps (informal or formal camps).

A combination of above indicators shows that about 82 percent of interviewed households met at least one of the recommended targeting criteria. As the indicators monitored in this round of outcome monitoring were not exhaustive to inform on the other elements included in the recommended targeting, the remaining 18 percent could have been selected based on other vulnerability indicators that are not monitored (including access to income etc.). In the coming rounds, the FSS will enhance the monitoring tool to collect additional information that inform on targeting of beneficiaries.

At governorate level, the analysis indicates that more than 60 percent of the households interviewed in all the governorates met at least one of the above targeting criteria. High proportion of households that had none of the above targeting criteria were noted in Deir-Ez-Zor (37%), Hama (34%) and Idleb (25%) governorates. As noted above, these households could have been selected based on other household’s vulnerability indicators that are not monitored in the outcome monitoring initiative including households access to income.
FIGURE 33: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT MET A NUMBER OF TARGETING CRITERIA BY GOVERNORATE

CONCLUSION
The outcome monitoring analysis indicates a worse-off food and livelihood situation during the lean season. The food consumption patterns, household dietary diversity and coping capacity of households shows a deteriorating situation though interviewed households were receiving assistance from various organizations. This is also an indication that the food security situation of targeted households could be worse without humanitarian assistance.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Partners to consider the design and implementation of activities that are suitable for lean season programming, targeting the vulnerable population groups from both displaced, residents, returnees and refugee population groups.

- Partners to consider supporting households with activities that reduce vulnerability to food and livelihood insecurity, including increasing access to food from own production.

- Review/develop a lean season household targeting criteria to include additional households that could be food insecure during or at the peak of the lean season. This could imply projecting for the lean season increase in people in need (PIN) - food insecure population.

- To further investigate high risk or exploitative work that is contributing to an increase in the percentage of households in the emergency livelihood based coping category. This should inform programming of activities that reduce the impact of these strategies on future productivity of the households.

- Implement activities that aim to reduce or eliminate the percentage of children working for food and other households needs, which is showing an increase in this round of outcome monitoring.

- Follow up on the sale of humanitarian assistance, and design appropriate activities to reduce the proportion of these food and non-food items that are sold in the market.
ANNEX I: AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS EACH FOOD GROUP WAS CONSUMED IN A PERIOD OF SEVEN DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNORATE</th>
<th>CEREALS AND TUBERS</th>
<th>LEGUMES</th>
<th>DAIRY</th>
<th>MEAT</th>
<th>VEGETABLES</th>
<th>OIL/FATS</th>
<th>SUGAR</th>
<th>CONDIMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Damascus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlib</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hasakeh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir-ez-Zor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Raqqqa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Sweida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quneitra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNEX II: FOOD CONSUMPTION GROUPS, 2017 VS 2016 PILOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quneitra</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hasakah</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Damascus</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlib</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Sweidas</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Raqqqa</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir-ez-Zor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartous</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX II: STEPS FOR SAMPLING PROCESS IN OMI-R2

**Step 1:** When the number of households reached was \( \geq 10,000 \) households

\[
n = \left( \frac{Z_{\alpha/2}}{e} \right)^2 \frac{(1 - P)k_f}{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}
\]

- \( n = \) Minimum sample size
- \( Z_{\alpha/2} = \) value of standard normal distribution
- \( P = \) the expected or probability of previous similar studies
- \( e = \) the maximum allowable deviation or error of the estimate.
- \( k_f = \) adjustment for potential loss of sample households due to non-response.
- \( f = \) the design effect, is an adjustment that should be used to determine survey sample size.

The following values were used in determining the minimum sample size in each of the sub district, for the outcome monitoring initiative:

- \( Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.645 \) for 90% Confidence Level
- The \( P \) was estimated at 50% to give the biggest sample size result (more conservative)
- The margin \( e \) of 10% was considered in the sampling.
- In this survey 10% non-response rate \( k_f \) was applied.
- The margin \( e \) of 10% was considered in the sampling.
- The design effect \( f \) of 1.5 was considered in the sampling.

\[
n = \frac{(1.645)^2(1-0.5)(1.1)(1.5)}{(0.1)^2(0.6)(1.7)} \approx 78 \text{ Households/Unit of Analysis}
\]

**Step 2:** When the number of households reached is \(< 10,000\) households

\[
n_{spz} = \frac{n}{1 + (n/spz)}
\]

Same as

\[
n_{spz} = \frac{(Z_{\alpha/2})^2 (1 - P)k_f}{e^2\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}
\]

Where

\( n_{spz} = \) minimum sample when the number of households assisted by the sector in the sub district is small

\( n = \) minimum sample when the number of households reached is large (number of households assisted by the sector is large)

\( spz = \) number of households assisted in the sub district

After determining the minimum households to be interviewed in each sub district - @ 90% CI and 10% margin of error as above, the community sample was then determined by proportion to the number of households reached in each community.

The above calculation was applied to determine the minimum number of households to be interviewed in each sub district. The calculation was based number of households assisted in the first quarter of 2017.

Some partners were expected to interview households that are more than the above minimum sample size for each sub district. A weighting process was applied to adjust for the oversampling in some of the sub districts.