

Ensuring Accountability in Reconstruction and Reform Efforts in Lebanon

Field Survey
Findings Report
June 2022

**Leila Dagher, Ph.D.,
Principal Investigator
Ld08@aub.edu.lb
American University of Beirut**

Please cite as:

Dagher, L., Tabsh G., Sidani, O., Abi Younes, O. (2022). "Ensuring Accountability in Reconstruction and Reform Efforts in Lebanon: Field Survey Findings Report."

Leila Dagher

American University of Beirut

Department of Economics

Email: ld08@aub.edu.lb

Ghina Tabsh

American University of Beirut

Department of Economics

Email: ghina@rpsmena.com

Ola Sidani

American University of Beirut

Department of Health Sciences

Email: os12@aub.edu.lb

Oussama Abi Younes

American University of Beirut

Department of Economics

Email: oa42@aub.edu.lb

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed herein should be attributed to the authors and not to the American University of Beirut.

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	3
A. Developing the Questionnaire	3
B. Determining the Target Sample	3
C. Data Collection Process	3
D. Data Cleaning	5
III.SURVEY FINDINGS	6
A. Eligibility and Demographics	6
B. Relevance and Effectiveness	11
C. Efficiency	13
D. Accountability	16
E. Transparency	17
F. Strengthening Social Cohesion and Conflict Prevention	20
G. Impact and Sustainability	21
IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	23
V. CONCLUSION	25
➤ Challenges and Observations	25
VI. APPENDIX	i
Appendix A: Tool 1 The Beirut Blast Recovery & Reconstruction Survey to the People	i
1. Eligibility and General Information.....	i
2. Relevance and Effectiveness.....	v
3. Efficiency.....	vi
4. Accountability.....	vii
5. Transparency.....	viii
6. Strengthening Social Cohesion and Conflict Prevention.....	ix
7. Impact and Sustainability.....	xi
Appendix B: Areas Where Aid Was Received	xiii

List of Tables

Table 1. Breakdown of Respondents	5
Table 2. Relevance of the Received Aid	11
Table 3. Level at Which the Aid Was Sufficient.....	12
Table 4. Sufficiency of Aid	12
Table 5. Perceived Aid Coordination by the Beneficiaries	14
Table 6. Aid Contribute to Alleviation of Suffering	15
Table 7. The Privacy of the Beneficiaries Was Respected When Receiving the Aid	16
Table 8. Fair versus Biased Aid Disbursement.....	18

List of Figures

Figure 1. Type of Respondent	6
Figure 2. Gender.....	6
Figure 3. Age.....	7
Figure 4. Level of Education	7
Figure 5. Nationality	8
Figure 6. Aid Prior to Port of Beirut Blast.....	8
Figure 7. Owned or Rented.....	8
Figure 8. Type of Aid	9
Figure 9. Contract Type	9
Figure 10. Rent Increased Post Renovation	10
Figure 11. Number of Visits per Aid Provider.....	11
Figure 12. Sufficiency of Aid	12
Figure 13. Ratio of Beneficiaries Receiving Duplicate Aid	13
Figure 14. None Received Aid	13
Figure 15. Type of Aid Needed.....	14
Figure 16. Follow up by Aid Providers	16
Figure 17. Aid Process and Tracking	17
Figure 18. Aid Providers Response to the Beneficiaries Request for Information	18
Figure 19. The Process of Applying to Aid.....	18
Figure 20. Aid Distribution by the Army	19
Figure 21. Aid Distribution by the NGOs	19
Figure 22. Aid and Social Cohesion.....	20
Figure 23. Still in Need for Aid	21
Figure 24. Appeal Contribution to Economic Recovery of the Businesses	21

I. INTRODUCTION

A powerful explosion at the Beirut Port on August 4, 2020, left Lebanon, already facing an unrelenting torrent of crises, with a serious humanitarian crisis. The explosion claimed more than 200 lives, more than 6500 injured, and left over 300,000 Lebanese homeless.¹ Based on the Beirut Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment conducted in August 2020, through a joint initiative of the World Bank Group (WBG), in cooperation with the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU), it was estimated that damages ranged between \$3.8 and \$4.6 billion USD and losses ranged between \$2.9 and \$3.5 billion USD.

In response to the disaster, international and regional actors have joined efforts to assist Lebanon, sending medical food donations and rescue teams to Beirut to tend to urgently needed relief. On August 9, 2020, an international support conference pledged almost \$298 million in immediate relief aid and the EU set its mapping system to support Lebanon to assess the damage and plan for reconstruction. Recognizing the endemic corruption and mismanagement as core factors leading to the blast, international actors have called for strong transparency and accountability reforms for the Lebanese government and state institutions to regain the trust of its people and supporting countries. In addition, due to the major discontent of the Lebanese people towards their government, many Lebanese are demanding that money and aid in the form of food, medical care and housing be channeled only through trusted local organizations.

Several recent reports and documentaries have questioned the transparency and accountability of international assistance related to the Port of Beirut (PoB) explosion. There are claims that millions of dollars have been misused or wasted to corruption. In order to fill this information gap, the American University of Beirut (AUB)² conducted a data collection exercise that included (1) field surveys of 250 aid beneficiaries in the PoB area, and (2) Key Informant Interviews³ (KIIs) with 25 experts in the field. This report presents preliminary findings from the field surveys, which were carried out as part of the project led by AUB and the Lebanese Transparency Association (LTA) and funded by Transparency International: "Ensuring Accountability in Reconstruction and Reform Efforts in Lebanon (EARREL)."

The project aims to ensure greater accountability and transparency of humanitarian aid and reconstructions efforts, particularly for those most affected by the Beirut port explosion. It will do so by better equipping local civil society and journalist networks in their roles as watchdogs, by supporting state actors to improve government reforms and manage crisis in transparency, and by equipping citizens to monitor and report corruption, particularly in areas of Beirut most affected by the explosion.

¹ Al-Hajj, S., Dhaini, H. R., Mondello, S., Kaafarani, H., Kobeissy, F., & DePalma, R. G. (2021). Beirut Ammonium Nitrate Blast: Analysis, Review, and Recommendations. *Frontiers in public health*, 9, 657996.

² The AUB project team is composed of: Dr. Leila Dagher, Dr. Ghina Tabsh, Ola Sidani, and Oussama Abi Younes.

³ Findings from Key Informant Interviews are presented in a separate report.

In the next phase of the project, the team will triangulate and contextualize the data collected via different methods to conduct an in-depth analysis of the data. The final report will subsequently present further examination of the aid process in the aftermath of the PoB explosion, and the tools best suited to strengthen and sustain the fight against fraud, waste, and abuse of international aid.

II. METHODOLOGY

This section describes the methodology that was developed and implemented during the field survey phase of the project, including: (a) the questionnaire and IRB approval; (b) the sampling strategy; (c) the data collection process including the challenges and limitations; and (d) the data cleaning process.

A. Developing the Questionnaire

The package submitted to the Institutional Review Board at AUB on November 20, 2021 included the IRB application, the consent script, and the survey questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was developed by the AUB team to facilitate the gathering of the desired information from a representative sample of aid recipients in the port of Beirut area. An extensive literature review conducted by the team informed the design of the data collection tools in terms of themes and specific questions. After several rounds of revisions, the IRB approval was granted on February 25, 2022.

B. Determining the Target Sample

The sample size of 250 surveys in the first round was predetermined by LTA research team and communicated to AUB research team. A second round with the same number of surveys is planned for August-September 2022. The names (and all identifying information) of all the respondents shall remain anonymous and undisclosed in the report as per AUB IRB rules. In the selection process, the team prioritized diversity and representativeness, to gain a more holistic picture about the aid process. Hence, the following inclusion criteria were applied.

- *Gender*: balanced inclusion of both male and female beneficiaries- making sure to meet the donor's minimum target of 30% women
- *Household versus Business*: inclusion of both households and businesses, landlords, and tenants
- *Nationality*: Lebanese and non-Lebanese beneficiaries
- *Neighborhoods*: All neighborhoods in the six zones (as categorized by the Army) that were affected by the blast. The primary concentration in this phase is to focus on the areas closer to the blast.

C. Data Collection Process

The firm Bridge Outsource Transform (BOT) was recruited to conduct the surveys. In order to be well-prepared for the data collection process, the AUB team of researchers in collaboration with the LTA team conducted three coaching sessions to get the BOT team of enumerators ready for the task.

On Monday 1 March 2022, the first session was held by the AUB research team, where they met online with the BOT management to explain the full and detailed scope of the project. As such, both teams discussed the logistics, the means of communication and reporting as well as the needed number of

enumerators and field support needed. It was agreed to deploy five enumerators to cover the Beirut Blast Area (namely adjacent to the Port) while taking into consideration the zoning map prepared by the army for the Blast. A field advisor and quality manager from BOT team also supported the team of enumerators. Dr. Leila Dagher, had secured a permission for the data collectors to ensure their safety during fieldwork from the Army Intelligence. The follow-up on the data collection process was monitored by the field supervisor, the quality control manager at BOT team, as well as Dr. Ghina Tabsh from AUB team via monitoring the online link where the data are updated on a daily basis.

The second coaching session for the team of enumerators was conducted online on Thursday March 3, 2022 at 12:00 pm. The session lasted for an hour, during which the survey was explained thoroughly to the enumerators and several discussions followed to clarify each question to the enumerators to enable them to probe on and to clarify the questions in the field where needed. The session also included the “Do’s and Don’ts” and expectations during the fieldwork.

The third coaching session was held by the LTA team on Thursday 7 March 2022 at the LTA office in Sodeco, where the enumerators were introduced to the aim of EARREL project, how their work would contribute to it, and the seriousness and the responsibility that is expected from them. The no harm and integrity measures were highlighted in this session to ensure that the data collection process is in line with the research ethical standards.

The survey was translated by a professional translator on Thursday 10 March 2022 and was consequently digitized. During the third week of March, the data collection process using digital devices was launched for pilot testing. During the pilot phase, close follow up and communication with the enumerators was taking place to make sure that the process flowed smoothly. In addition, the quality of the data was double-checked before giving the team the green light to proceed with the targeted 250 questionnaires. The full data were collected and finalized by Wednesday April 6, 2022.

The survey revolved around the Beirut blast recovery and reconstruction aids received by beneficiaries who resided in the most damaged areas in Beirut. The tool included 45 questions and lasted on an average for 20 minutes per beneficiary on the Survey CTO tool. Some surveys took up to 45 minutes to explain, elaborate and get the consent from the beneficiary. Recruitment faced some challenges as the target participants were drained by the number of interviews/surveys they have been invited to participate in post-explosion. All 258 interviews (see Table 1) were conducted anonymously, in person with a consented audio recording, by a team of 5 enumerators from BOT.

- Target: 250 surveys (equally split between households and businesses)
- Collected: 258 surveys (84% Households and 16% Businesses)

Table 1. Breakdown of Respondents

Households			Businesses		
Completed	Refusal	Not Eligible	Completed	Refusal	Not Eligible
210	78	138	48	27	156

"Not Eligible" implies that those respondents did not receive any aid, although in need.

D. Data Cleaning

BOT and AUB research team validated and cleaned the data all throughout the collection process and continued after closing the data collection process once the targeted number of surveys was secured. Random samples of surveys were double-checked via listening to the recordings, especially those held during the pilot phase and first week of the data collection process, to ensure the quality of the collected data. After completing the data collection phase, BOT and AUB research teams went over the excel sheets to unify the data, make sure it's consistent and to check for any anomalies and outliers. The cleanliness of the dataset, a good indication that the survey was well designed, allowed for the inclusion of all surveys.

A total of 258 surveys were collected and validated. The final data set is saved in excel format with all the relevant recordings on a shared drive accessible to the AUB research team as conditioned by IRB office at AUB.

Next, for the data analysis, the data were coded and uploaded to SPSS software to generate the statistics. The AUB research team first reviewed the statistics and findings after which they agreed on further segregations and cross tabulations to generate the findings report.

III. SURVEY FINDINGS

A. Eligibility and Demographics


This section presents the eligibility criteria followed, along with the sample demographics to enable the researchers to understand the specific characteristics of the respondents better. This will ensure the inclusion of the different beneficiaries, namely, households or businesses, males or females, different age groups, different needs, different nationalities, and different areas. The aid was received by the beneficiaries in several areas where the most recurrent areas in descending order were Ashrafieh, Qoubaiyat, Karantina, Gemmayze, Nasra and Mar Mkhayel, Borj Hammoud and others.⁴

The last part of this section investigates the type of aid received and further details that are essential for this study, including but not limited to, renovation particularities.

Type of Respondent

The sample included both household and business beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement. More specifically, the sample included 81% households and 19% businesses. For the businesses, the respondents are 80% owners or owner's son, and 20% are managers or supervisors. On another note, 63% of the household respondents are unemployed.


Figure 1. Type of Respondent



Gender

One of our goals was to be as gender inclusive as possible and thus the data collection team tried their best to balance the sample accordingly. Overall, 58% of the respondents who benefited from aid disbursement are females, while 42% are males. More specifically, for households 53% of the respondents

Figure 2. Gender




⁴ For the detailed aid distribution per area and per street, refer to Appendix B.

were females and 28% were males. As for businesses, the ratio of males exceeded that of females, 14% to 5% respectively. In general, female participants tend to be more responsive; hence, the ratio of females for the households sample was higher, while for businesses we targeted the owner or the manager to answer the survey and these are mostly men.

Age

The data collection team worked on collecting data from a diversified sample of different age groups. Around 29% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement are above 64 years old, in addition to another 29% between 51 and 64 years old. Only 8% are between 18 and 28 years old, while the remaining 25% of the beneficiaries are between 29 and 50 years old.


Figure 3. Age



Level of Education

The respondents come from different educational backgrounds. Almost 32% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement have school level education, followed by 25% who have Bachelor of Arts or Science (BA/BS) degree. Only 2% have Doctorate educational level. The remaining beneficiaries either have Technical Baccalaureate Diploma (BT) or Masters/MBA educational level, in addition to 21% who dropped school or have no education whatsoever.


Figure 4. Level of Education



Nationality

Overall, 85% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement are Lebanese, in addition to 13% who are Syrian. The remaining beneficiaries are 0.4% Palestinian, and 2% foreigners from other nationalities.


Figure 5. Nationality



Aid Prior to the Explosion

Among the respondents 97% did not receive any aid prior to Port of Beirut explosion. Only 3% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid post Port of Beirut explosion were benefitting from aid support before the explosion. The aid prior to the explosion was received from NGOs, INGOs, and the Red Cross consisting mainly of 50% food, 34% cash, and 16% health care.


Figure 6. Aid Prior to Port of Beirut Explosion



Owned or Rented

The sample included beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement and who are either owners of a household or a business; 31% landlords and 69% tenants. More specifically 4% of the businesses and 27% of the households owned, while 14% of the businesses and 54% of the households rented.


Figure 7. Owned or Rented



Type of Aid Received

Four types of aid support prevailed for both households and businesses; cash, food, renovation and to a lesser extent WASH. Delving into more details among the household and businesses, the findings in this project indicate that the renovation type of aid supported 22% business rentals and 48% households in addition to 4% business owners and 24% households.

Figure 8. Type of Aid




Moreover, a good number of beneficiaries (62%) who benefited from aid disbursement received cash aid. Around 47% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received food aid and 46% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received renovation aid. Around 8% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received WASH aid, while 2% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received psychosocial support. About 0.8% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received healthcare aid. Similarly, 0.8% of beneficiaries who benefited from aid disbursement received other aid, which is supermarket coupons. Only 0.4% received housing aid. None of the respondents in this sample received employment aid, nor education or in-kind grants.

Renovation and Contract Type

Most of the beneficiaries who benefited from renovation aid corresponding to 61% have an old contract (of which 20% are businesses and 41% are households). Almost 21% have no written contract (of which 5% are businesses and 16% are households). Only 18% have a new contract (of which 6% are businesses and 12% are households).


Figure 9. Contract Type



Rent Increase Post Renovation

Findings in this project showed that among those who received renovation support, 56% did not face any rent increase after the renovation; the percentages are split between 20% businesses and 36% households. On the other hand, 44% experienced some rent increase and the main reason stated is currency depreciation. Few businesses and households (1%) indicated that the increase in rent was due solely to the increase in value of the property after renovation.

Figure 10. Rent Increase Post Renovation




B. Relevance and Effectiveness

The Relevance of the Received Aid to the Beneficiaries' Needs

More than half of the beneficiaries (58%) who benefited from aid were not asked about their needs. About half of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid received either 0 or 1 visit from aid providers preceding the actual disbursement. The rest received 2 or more visits of which 18% received 5 or more visits.

Figure 11. Number of Visits per Aid Provider



Almost 31% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid rated the relevance of the aid to their need as acceptable. Only 21% of them believe that the aid is relevant of which 6% believe that it is perfect. However, about 48% of the beneficiaries believe that the aid is not relevant to their needs of which 23% believe that it is not relevant at all. It is worth noting that almost all those who rate the aid as irrelevant are those who received food.

Table 2. Relevance of the Received Aid

Relevance of the Received Aid		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Not relevant at all	59	23
Somehow relevant	64	25
Acceptable	79	31
Very relevant	40	15
Perfect	16	6
Total	258	100

The Level at which Aid Was Perceived as Sufficient by the Beneficiaries


The majority of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid corresponding to 63% believe that the aid was not sufficient, of which 40% believe that it was not sufficient at all. Only 14% believe that the aid was either very sufficient or perfect. The remaining 23% beneficiaries feel that the aid was acceptable.

Table 3. Level at Which the Aid Was Sufficient

Level at Which the Aid Was Sufficient		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Not sufficient at all	104	40
Somehow sufficient	60	23
Acceptable	59	23
Very Sufficient	27	11
Perfect	8	3
Total	258	100

More specifically and after establishing that among the major types of aid received and given that food aid was mainly irrelevant, further investigation regarding cash and renovation aid shows that 65% and 64% respectively consider the aid as not sufficient.

Figure 12. Sufficiency of Aid



The Level at Which the Aid or Support Result in Positive Changes for the Beneficiaries

Almost half of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid corresponding to 46% believe that the aid did not result in positive change to them, of which 24% believe that it did not at all. Only 23% believe that it resulted in considerable change or solved the problem completely. The remaining beneficiaries (32%) believe that the aid resulted in an acceptable positive change to them.


Table 4. Sufficiency of Aid

The Level at Which the Aid or Support Result in Positive Changes for the Beneficiaries		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
No change at all	61	24
Somehow	56	22
Acceptable	83	32
Considerable Change	49	19
solved the problem completely	9	4
Total	258	100

C. Efficiency

Almost 29% of the beneficiaries received aid from both the Army and the NGOs. The table below shows that 60% of the beneficiaries received aid from NGOs with a similar percentage (56%) receiving aid from the Army. Individual initiatives from neighbors, friends and even people from the neighborhood supported 35% of the beneficiaries in this sample. The political parties along with the municipality served less than 2% of the beneficiaries. There are 3% of the beneficiaries who are not sure who was their aid provider.


Figure 13. Sources of Aid



People Who Needed Support but Were Not Helped, Despite Asking for Help


The respondents were asked if they knew individuals who needed help but never received assistance despite asking for it. Around 35% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid indicated that they know someone who needed support but was not helped, in spite of asking for help.

Figure 14. Requested Aid but Did Not Receive Any



The highest percentages accounted for the need of cash (49%), renovation (48%), food (24%) and healthcare (23%). Other aid types had lower demand; 4% housing help, 2% WASH help, 1% employment and 1% in-kind grant help. Other types of aid were mentioned as well such as furniture, clothes and 33% work-related tools.

Figure 15. Type of Aid Needed



Perceived Level of Coordination Among the Aid Providers

Around 29% of the beneficiaries believed that there was no coordination among the aid donors but rather complete chaos, with another 26% who perceived that there is some level of coordination. In contrast, 37% of the beneficiaries perceived a good level of coordination. The remaining (8%) were not sure.

Table 5. Perceived Level of Coordination Among Aid Providers

Perceived Aid Coordination by the Beneficiaries		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
No coordination at all (complete chaos)	75	29
Some level of coordination	26	10
Acceptable level of coordination	42	16
Very High coordination	19	7
Perfect coordination	77	30
Don't know	19	8
Total	258	100

Aid Contribution to Alleviation of Suffering

Only 27% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid believe that the provided aid had an acceptable contribution to the alleviation of their suffering, in addition to 12% who believe that the contribution was considerable and 3% who believe that it solved the problem completely. However, more than half of the beneficiaries believe either that the provided aid only somehow contributed to the alleviation of their suffering or did not at all.

Table 6. Aid Contribution to Alleviation of Suffering

Aid Contribute to Alleviation of Suffering		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Not at all	74	29
Somehow	76	30
Acceptable	69	27
Considerably	31	12
Solved the problem completely	8	3
Total	258	100

D. Accountability

The Privacy of the Beneficiaries Was Respected When Receiving the Aid

The majority of the beneficiaries (90%) who benefited from aid either strongly agree or agree that their privacy was respected when receiving the aid and during communication with the donor. Only 4% disagree, while 6% are neutral.


Table 7. Privacy of the Beneficiaries Was Respected When Receiving Aid

Privacy of the Beneficiaries Was Respected When Receiving Aid		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	1
Disagree	8	3
Neutral (Neither Agree nor Disagree)	15	6
Agree	64	25
Strongly Agree	168	65
Total	258	100

Communication and Follow-up by Aid Providers

More than half of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid (59%) mentioned that there wasn't any follow up or evaluation from the donor's side, in addition to 26% who mentioned there was one follow-up after the intervention. Only 10% mentioned that there was frequent follow up or evaluation and 3% mentioned rare follow-up. The follow up was generally done by the NGOs and not by other aid providers.

Figure 16. Follow-up by Aid Providers




E. Transparency

The majority of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid corresponding to 67% did not know how and where to request information about support they might be eligible for in contrast to only 24% who believe that it was very easy. Almost 59% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid were not able to access all the information they required to apply for support at all, in contrast to 34% who believe that it was very easy. Almost 69% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid believe that they were not able to track the disbursement of the support at all, in contrast to only 10% who believe that it was very easy. Another 12% believe that it was acceptable.

The two main aid providers were the Army and the NGOs, the aid disbursement process was considered somehow smooth and unbiased. The responses show a slightly better experience with the Army in terms of being less biased when compared to NGOs. Among the beneficiaries who received aid from the NGOs 56% considered the aid disbursement as biased and 45% considered the aid disbursed by the Army as biased.

Figure 17. Aid Process and Tracking



Aid Providers' Response to the Beneficiaries' Request for Information

The sampled beneficiaries were asked whether aid providers responded to the beneficiaries' request for information and the results indicated that 34% of the beneficiaries believe that aid providers did not respond to their request for information at all. In addition to 9% who believe that they somehow

did. However, only 27% believe that they did in a timely and comprehensive manner. Finally, 21% believe that they did in an acceptable manner.

Figure 18. Aid Providers' Response to the Beneficiaries' Request for Information

Aid Providers' Response to the Beneficiaries' Request for Information		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Not At All	88	34
Somehow	22	9
Acceptable	54	21
Good	24	9
In A Timely and Comprehensive Manner	70	27
Total	258	100

The Process of Applying for Aid

Most of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid believe that the application process was not complicated, of which 44% of them believe that it was simple and clear. Only 14% believe that it was complicated and unclear.

Figure 19. The Process of Applying for Aid

The Process of Applying for Aid		
	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	36	14
2	16	6
3	60	23
4	33	13
5	113	44
Total	258	100

*Where the range goes from "1" being very complicated to "5" being very simple and clear.

Fairness of Aid Disbursement

Only 23% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid believe that the distribution of aid was completely fair, another 21% believed it was somehow fair. In contrast, 26% believe that it was completely biased and 8% believe that it was somehow biased. Few beneficiaries (21%) were undecided or had no answer.

Table 8. Fairness of Aid Disbursement

Fairness of Aid Disbursement		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Completely Biased	67	26
Somehow Biased	55	21
Undecided	14	5
Somehow Fair	21	8
Completely Fair	60	23
I Don't Know	41	16
Total	258	100

Figure 20. Aid Distribution by the Army

26% of the beneficiaries receiving aid from the Army rated the aid as completely fair, while 24% rated it as completely biased.





Figure 21. Aid Distribution by the NGOs


19% of the beneficiaries receiving aid from the NGOs rated the aid as completely fair, while 30% rated it as completely biased.



F. Strengthening Social Cohesion and Conflict Prevention

In this section, the researchers investigate the role of aid disbursement in strengthening the social cohesion and in conflict prevention.

Figure 22. Aid and Social Cohesion



Our findings show that 35% of aid beneficiaries agree that the aid intervention played a role in initiating healthy relationships between them and the civil society (as a major aid provider), in addition to 6% who strongly agree. Whereas another 35% oppose this assessment, whereby they either disagree or strongly disagree.

Moreover, 39% of aid beneficiaries agree that the aid intervention enhanced their feeling of belonging to their society/area/neighborhood, in addition to 7% who strongly agree. In contrast, only 25% either disagree or strongly disagree with this assessment.


In addition, 43% of aid beneficiaries agree that the aid intervention strengthened the feelings of cooperation, support and solidarity with fellow Lebanese and non-Lebanese citizens in their area/neighborhood, in addition to 8% who strongly agree. In contrast, only 16% either disagree or strongly disagree with this assessment.

Similarly, to the beneficiaries' perception about the lack of fairness of aid disbursement, 55% of aid beneficiaries disagree that they believe that aid intervention was distributed equally among POB area residents. Among the beneficiaries, 38% believe that the intervention included minority groups and individuals (ethnic, religious, special needs, women).

G. Impact and Sustainability

Among the sample in the study, 67% of aid beneficiaries still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut Explosion recovery, namely in relevance to renovation and cash. More specifically, only 6% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery need psychological support. About 21% of aid beneficiaries who still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need healthcare help. Only 2% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need education help. Around 46% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need renovation help. Only 4% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need housing help. Half of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need cash help. Only 15% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need food help. Only 4% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need WASH help. Only 0.6% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need employment help. Only 0.6% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need in kind grant help. Only 9% of the beneficiaries, who benefited from aid and still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, need other type of help such as home equipment and furniture in addition to certain store items and tools.

Figure 23. Still in Need for Aid



The Aid's Contribution to Economic Recovery of the Businesses

Almost half of the beneficiaries (50%) who benefited from renovation/construction aid of a business, believe that the aid did not contribute to the recovery of their business at all. However, only 21% believe that the aid considerably or definitely contributed.

Figure 24. Aid Contribution to Economic Recovery of the Businesses

Aid Contribution to Economic Recovery of the Businesses		
	Frequency/Count	Percent
Not At All	23	47.9
Somehow	7	14.6
Acceptable	8	16.7
Considerably	8	16.7
Definitely	2	4.2
Total	248	100.0

Negative Feedback

Around 26% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid have negative feedback on aid providers. Most of the negative feedback of the beneficiaries can be listed as insufficient aid, lack of response when reached out to, corruption, lack of organization and absence of follow-ups, the aid disbursement process was not fair and not complete, in addition to low-quality products used or given. Almost 26% of those with negative feedback highlighted that the process was unfair on two levels. On the first level, some people received aid but others such as their neighbors did not. On a second level, it was biased towards certain areas or sects. Some also used the term "corruption within the NGOs" to describe the aid process as unfair, biased, and inefficient. Others commented on the lack of organization during the aid disbursement process. We quote some of the expressions used here "complete chaos", "not organized, not equal to people, no protocol, and no strategy." Some beneficiaries noted that the process was humiliating "humiliating the individuals in order to receive the aid and sometimes the aid being inefficient, and the food provided was sometimes expired." Few beneficiaries indicated that NGOs helped fill out surveys with them but never came back. Others noted the lack of follow up especially regarding the quality of the renovation. For example, one respondent said, "there wasn't any follow-up regarding renovation after checking the damages", and another said, "the door broke after they fixed it." Last but not least, many commented that they called the NGOs but no one responded. All those claims are validated in the KIIs. The interviewees, who represent NGOs and other entities, had similar observations regarding the aid disbursement process.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following findings are based on the random sample of 258 beneficiaries from aid disbursement during Port of Beirut explosion. Most of the respondents who benefitted from aid are Lebanese households above 40 years old, with school or higher degrees, of which 58% were females 42% were males. The unemployed beneficiaries outnumber the employed ones. The aid reception took place in several dispersed areas, while the most frequent areas were those closer to the blast, including but not limited to, Ashrafieh, Qoubaiyat, Karantina, Gemmayze, Nasra, Mar Mkhayel and Borj Hamoud. The sample included beneficiaries from different nationalities, but with a majority of Lebanese citizens (85% Lebanese). The most frequent received aids were cash, food, renovation and to a lesser extent WASH. Only 3% of the beneficiaries who benefitted from aid post Port of Beirut explosion were benefitting from aid support before the Port explosion. The aid prior to the explosion was received from NGOs, INGOs, and the Red Cross consisting mainly of 50% food, 38% cash, 13% health care.

Most of the beneficiaries' households/businesses were rented not owned; the sample included 31% owners and 69% rentals. More specifically 4% of the businesses and 27% of the households owned the property, while 14% of the businesses and 54% of the households rented. The majority of the beneficiaries who benefitted from renovation aid corresponding to 61% have an old contract. Findings in this project showed that among those who received renovation support, 56% did not face any rent increase after the renovation; the percentages are split between 20% businesses and 36% households. The majority of the beneficiaries rated the relevance of the aid to their needs, the sufficiency of the aid, and the coordination of aid disbursement, contribution of the aid to alleviation of their suffering and its positive change result for them as acceptable or below.

More than half of them were not asked about their needs and have received either one or no visits from aids providers before the actual disbursement. Around 29% of the beneficiaries received support by different entities, in which the most frequent entities who offered this support were NGOs and the Lebanese Army. The majority agree that their privacy was respected when receiving the aid and during communications with the donor. Very few aid providers are still communicating or following up with the beneficiaries. About 35% know people who needed help and did not receive it, in spite of asking. The most frequent needs of these people were cash, renovation, and food.

More than half of the beneficiaries did not know how and where to request information about support they might be eligible for, nor where they were able to access all the information they required to apply for support. They rated the response of aid providers to their request for information in a timely and comprehensive manner as acceptable or below. Moreover, they were not able to track the disbursement of their support. On the other hand, they rated the process of applying for disbursement as acceptable and above, simple, and clear. Almost half of the beneficiaries believe that the distribution of aid was biased, either somehow or completely.

Those who agree that the aid intervention played a role in initiating healthy relationships between them (general public) and the civil society actors (aid providers) are a little bit more than those who disagree. However, those who agree that the aid intervention enhanced their feeling of belonging to their society/area/neighborhood and strengthened the feelings of cooperation, support and solidarity with fellow Lebanese and non-Lebanese citizens in their area/neighborhood are considerably more than those who disagree.

The majority of the beneficiaries are not able to benefit from the received aid until today. Among the sample in the study, 67% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut explosion recovery, namely in relevance to renovation and cash. Around half the respondents (50%) believe that the appeal did not contribute to the economic recovery of their business at all or somehow did.

Around 26% of the beneficiaries who benefited from aid have negative feedback on the aid providers. Most of the negative feedback of the beneficiaries can be listed as not enough, lack of response when reached out to, corruption, lack of organization and follow ups, the aid disbursement process was not fair and not complete, in addition to low quality products used or given.

V. CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that a huge effort was put forth from the NGOs, the private sector (individual initiatives) and the Army to alleviate the pain of Port of Beirut Blast victims. The results also show a major gap in terms of relevance, efficiency, coordination, and fairness. Many beneficiaries received food donations that were not very needed or in amounts that exceeded their needs. There was duplication of work essentially between aid provided by the NGOs and the Army. Some beneficiaries indicated that the aid was not enough especially those receiving cash and renovation aid. However, it is worth mentioning that the explosion and post-explosion phase, during which the aid intervention took place, is accompanied by severe economic deterioration and rapid inflation. Therefore, the need for more aid cannot be strictly related to the blast but perhaps also to the excruciating economic, financial, and political crisis, the country is suffering from. Further elaborations and clarifications shall be provided in the qualitative findings report based on the 25 Key Informant Interviews that the AUB research team conducted with representatives from NGOs, UN, World Bank, Embassies, Coalitions, decision makers and others.

➤ Challenges and Observations

This report presents preliminary findings from the field surveys data collection part of the project led by AUB and the Lebanese Transparency Association and funded by Transparency International: "Ensuring Accountability in Reconstruction and Reform Efforts in Lebanon (EARREL)." The project aims to ensure greater accountability and transparency of humanitarian aid and reconstructions efforts, particularly for those most affected by the Beirut port explosion.

The thorough planning and follow-up from both the AUB research team and the BOT Team allowed for a relatively smooth and successful data collection process. We encountered a few hurdles that were overcome by the continuous communication between the two teams. The highlights of the challenges are summarized in the points below.

1. Some of the target areas were not residential and those that were, had very high security measures implemented, complicating the data collectors' access. These include, among others, the following neighborhoods: Biel, Zaytouna Bay, Downtown. ...
2. Although the target was equally split between households and businesses, the data collectors came across many business owners who were in need but did not receive any aid. Most of them were visited by many aid providers for needs assessment only with no serious implementation, so they ended up using their own resources.
3. A few respondents refused to take the survey because of the audio recording despite the enumerators' multiple reassurances regarding anonymity.

4. A few respondents had the Lebanese Army tag on their doors, but they stated that they did not receive any aid.
5. The constant power outage was always an obstacle to access buildings.
6. One respondent stated that in one instance food boxes were delivered for media coverage only, then these boxes were immediately retrieved.

This preliminary report will be followed by a more detailed final report containing an in-depth investigation of the full set of data collected through surveys and KIIs. The final report will present a more comprehensive analysis of the provision of humanitarian aid post PoB explosion and make some policy recommendations.

VI. APPENDIX

Appendix A: Tool 1 The Beirut Blast Recovery & Reconstruction Survey to the People

الأداة 1 استبيان الإصلاح والتعافي وإعادة إعمار المساكن للمتضررين من انفجار مرفأ بيروت

1. Eligibility and General Information / الأهلية ومعلومات عامة

1. Did you directly or indirectly benefit from any aid after the Port of Beirut Blast (PoBB)? If answer is no, not eligible

هل استفدت بطريقة مباشرة أو غير مباشرة من أي مساعدة بعد انفجار مرفأ بيروت؟ إذا كانت الإجابة كلا، فغير مؤهل.

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

2. Business or Household / محل او منزل

- Business / محل - مؤسسة
- Household / منزل

3. IF Business:

What is your position in the business? / ما هو موقعك في العمل؟

4. Sex / الجنس

- Male / ذكر
- Female / أنثى

5. Age / العمر

- [18-28[
- [29-39[
- [40-50[
- [51-64[
- [more than 64[/ 64 أكثر من

6. Educational Level / المستوى العلمي

- School / شهادة مدرسية

- شهادة البكالوريا الفنية / BT
- شهادة جامعية / بكالوريوس / BA/BS
- شهادة الماجستير/ماجستير في إدارة الأعمال / Masters /MBA
- شهادة الدكتوراه / Doctorate
- أوقف دراسته - غير متعلم / Dropped School - No education

7. Are you currently employed? / هل أنت موظف حالياً؟

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

8. Nationality / الجنسية

- Lebanese / اللبنانية
- Syrian / السورية
- Palestinian / الفلسطينية
- Other Arab Nationality / جنسية عربية أخرى
- Foreigner / أجنبي

9. Area where aid was received [please add all areas in the zones]

المنطقة التي تلقيت المساعدة فيها (يرجى ذكر جميع المناطق)

- Achrafieh
- Ain El Mreisseh
- Al Marfaa
- Bachoura
- Badawi
- Biel / Zaytouna Bay
- Bourj Hammoud
- Daoura
- DT/Bab Idriss
- Furn El Hayek
- Geitawi
- Gemmayze
- Grand Serail
- Hotel Dieu
- Karantina
- Karm El Zaytoun
- Khodor
- Majidieh
- Mar Mikhael

- Medawar
- Minat El Hosn
- Nassrah
- NejmeH Square
- Qoubaiyat
- Rmeil
- Saifi
- Sassine / Mar Mitr
- Sioufi
- Sodeco
- St. Georges - Roum
- St. Nicolas
- Sursock
- USJ
- Zokak El Blat
- Other _____

10. Location where aid was received (street)

الموقع الذي تلقيت المساعدة فيه (الشارع)

.....

11. Is the household / business owned or rented? / هل المنزل / المحل ملك او أجار؟

- Owned / ملك
- Rented/ أجار

12. Type of Aid Received [check box] / نوع المساعدة التي تلقيتها [اختر الخانة المناسبة]

- psychosocial support, / دعم نفسي واجتماعي
- healthcare, / رعاية صحية
- education, / تعليم
- renovation, / ترميم
- housing, / إسكان
- cash, / أموال نقدية
- food, / مواد غذائية
- WASH (water sanitation and hygiene) / (مواد تنظيف) تعقيم المياه والنظافة العامة
- Employment / فرصة عمل
- In Kind Grant / مساعدة عينية

- Other / غير ذلك _____

13. If the received aid is renovation, then did the rent increase after renovation?

إذا كانت المساعدة عبارة عن ترميم، فهل زاد الإيجار الشهري بعد الترميم؟

- Yes, due to the currency depreciation, the owner raised the rent.
نعم، بسبب تدهور العملة لجأ المالك إلى رفع الإيجار .
- Yes, the value of the property increased after renovation, so the owner raised the rent
نعم، ازدادت قيمة العقار بعد الترميم، فرفع المالك الإيجار.
- Yes, due to the currency depreciation and increased value of the property after renovation, the owner raised the rent.
نعم، بسبب تدهور العملة وبسبب ازدياد قيمة العقار بعد الترميم، لجأ المالك إلى رفع الإيجار.
- No, the rent remained the same.

كلا، بقي الإيجار كما هو.

14. If the received aid is renovation, what is the contract type?

إذا تلقيت مساعدة ترميم، فما هو نوع العقد؟

- Old / قديم
- New / جديد
- No written contract / لا يوجد عقد خطي

15. Were you benefitting from any type of aid before the Port explosion?

هل كنت تستفيد من أي مساعدة أخرى قبل انفجار المرفأ؟

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

16. If yes, please describe type/form of aid/value of aid/source of aid

إذا كانت الإجابة نعم، أذكر نوع المساعدة/شكل المساعدة/قيمة المساعدة/الجهة التي قدّمت المساعدة؟

.....

2. الملاءمة والفعالية / Relevance and Effectiveness

17. Rate the relevance of the received aid to your needs.

ما مدى ملاءمة المساعدة التي تلقيتها مقارنة باحتياجاتك.

- 1 not relevant at all / 1 ليست ملائمة على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow relevant / 2 ملائمة بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 مقبولة
- 4 Very relevant / 4 ملائمة جدًا
- 5 Perfect / 5 ممتازة

18. Were you asked about your needs?

هل سئلت عن احتياجاتك؟

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

19. Rate whether the aid was sufficient.

هل كانت المساعدة كافية أم لا.

- 1 not sufficient at all / 1 ليست كافية على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow sufficient / 2 كافية بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 مقبولة
- 4 Very sufficient / 4 كافية جدًا
- 5 Perfect / 5 ممتازة

20. How many visits preceded the actual disbursement?

كم عدد الزيارات التي سبقت التحصيل الفعلي؟

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more / 5 أكثر من

21. To what extent did the aid or support result in positive changes for you?

إلى أي مدى أدت المساعدة أو الدعم إلى تغييرات إيجابية بالنسبة إليك؟

- 1 no change at all / 1 لم تغير شيئ على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow / 2 بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 مقبولة

- 4 considerable change / 4 تغيير كبير
- 5 solved the problem completely / 5 ممتازة

3. Efficiency / الكفاءة

22. Were you offered support by different entities? [check box]

هل حصلت على الدعم من أطراف مختلفة؟ [اختر الخانة المناسبة]

- No / كلا
- Yes NGO / نعم، منظمات غير حكومية
- Yes, People form Neighborhood / نعم، أشخاص من الحي
- Yes, Political Parties / نعم، أطراف سياسية
- Yes, I don't know who / نعم، ولكن لا أعلم من
- Yes, army / نعم، الجيش
- Yes, municipality / نعم، البلدية

23. Did you feel there was coordination in aid disbursement?

هل شعرت أنه كان هناك تنسيق خلال توزيع المساعدات؟

- 1 no coordination at all (complete chaos) / 1 (لا يوجد تنسيق أبدًا) (فوضى تامة)
- 2 some level of coordination / 2 مستوى معين من التنسيق
- 3 acceptable level of coordination / 3 مستوى مقبول من التنسيق
- 4 Very High coordination / 4 تنسيق عالي جدًا
- 5 Perfect coordination / 5 تنسيق ممتاز
- 0 I don't know / 0 لا أعلم

24. Did the provided aid contribute to alleviation of your suffering?

هل ساهمت المساعدة المقدمة في التخفيف من معاناتك؟

- 1 not at all / 1 كلا على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow / 2 بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 بشكلٍ مقبول
- 4 considerably / 4 بشكلٍ كبير
- 5 solved the problem completely / 5 ممتازة

4. المساءلة / Accountability

25. Was your privacy respected when receiving the aid and during communications with the donor?

هل تمّ احترام خصوصيتك عند تلقي المساعدة وأثناء التواصل مع الجهة المانحة؟

- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
- 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
- 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 (محايد) لا أوافق ولا أعارض
- 4 Agree / 4 أوافق
- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

26. Do you still communicate with the donor?

هل ما زلت تتواصل مع الجهة المانحة؟

- 1 Not at all / 1 كلا على الإطلاق
- 2 Once after the intervention / 2 مرة واحدة بعد التدخل
- 3 Once a year / 3 مرة في السنة
- 4 Rarely / 4 نادرًا
- 5 Frequently / 5 غالبًا

27. Was there any follow up or evaluation from the donor's side?

هل كانت هناك أي متابعة أو تقييم من جانب الجهة المانحة؟

- 1 Not at all / 1 كلا على الإطلاق
- 2 Once after the intervention / 2 مرة واحدة بعد التدخل
- 3 Once a year / 3 مرة في السنة
- 4 Rarely / 4 نادرًا
- 5 Frequently / 5 غالبًا

28. Do you know of anyone who needed support but was not helped, in spite of asking for help?

هل تعرف ما إذا كان هناك شخصًا ما احتاج إلى الدعم ولكن لم تتم مساعدته على الرغم من طلبه المساعدة؟

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

29. If yes, what kind of help was needed. [check box]

إذا كانت الإجابة نعم، فما نوع المساعدة المطلوبة. [اختر الخانة المناسبة]

- psychosocial support, / دعم نفسي واجتماعي

- healthcare, / رعاية صحية
- education, / تعليم
- renovation, / ترميم
- housing, / إسكان
- cash, / أموال نقدية
- food, / مواد غذائية
- WASH (water sanitation and hygiene) / (مواد تنظيف (تعقيم المياه والنظافة العامة
- Employment / فرصة عمل
- In Kind Grant / مساعدة عينية
- Other / غير ذلك _____

5. الشفافية / Transparency

30. From a scale of 1 to 5, did you know how and where to request information about support you might have been eligible for.

من 1 إلى 5: كنت تعرف كيف واين يمكنك الوصول إلى المعلومات حول الدعم الذي كنت مؤهل للحصول عليه

- 1 Complicated and unclear / 1 معقدة وغير واضحة
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 Simple and Clear / 5 بسيطة وواضحة

31. From a scale from 1 to 5: you were able to access all the information you required to apply for support

من 1 إلى 5: كنت قادراً على الوصول إلى المعلومات التي انت بحاجة اليها لتقديم طلب للحصول على الدعم؟

- 1 Complicated and unclear / 1 معقدة وغير واضحة
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 Simple and Clear / 5 بسيطة وواضحة

32. From a scale 1 to 5: aid providers responded to your request for information

من 1 إلى 5: استجاب مقدمو المساعدة لطلبك للحصول على معلومات ؟

- 1 Complicated and unclear / 1 معقدة وغير واضحة
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5 Simple and Clear / 5 بسيطة وواضحة
33. From a scale 1 to 5: you were able to track the disbursement of the support
من 1 إلى 5: تمكنت من متابعة طلب المساعدة الذي تقدمت بها
- 1 Complicated and unclear / 1 معقدة وغير واضحة
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 Simple and Clear / 5 بسيطة وواضحة

34. On a scale from 1 to 5 rate the process of applying disbursement.
من 1 إلى 5، كيف تقيّم عملية تطبيق توزيع المساعدات؟
- 1 Complicated and unclear / 1 معقدة وغير واضحة
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 Simple and Clear / 5 بسيطة وواضحة

35. The distribution of aid was
عملية التوزيع كانت
- 1 completely biased / 1 متحيزة تمامًا
 - 2 somehow biased / 2 متحيزة بعض الشيء
 - 3 undecided / 3 مقبولة
 - 4 somehow fair / 4 عادلة بعض الشيء
 - 5 Completely fair / 5 عادلة جدًا
 - 6 I Don't Know / 6 لا أعرف

6. Strengthening Social Cohesion and Conflict Prevention

تعزيز التماسك الاجتماعي ومنع النزاعات

36. Do you believe that the aid intervention played a role in initiating healthy relationships between you (general public) & the civil society actors (aid providers)?
هل تعتقد أنّ المساعدة ساهمت في إرساء علاقات صحية بينك (عامّة الناس) وبين الجهات الفاعلة في المجتمع المدني (مقدمي المساعدة)؟
- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
 - 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
 - 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 محايد (لا أوافق ولا أعارض)
 - 4 Agree / 4 أوافق

- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

37. In your opinion, the aid intervention enhanced your feeling of belonging to your Society/area/neighborhood?

هل برأيك ساهمت المساعدة في تعزيز شعورك بالانتماء إلى مجتمعك / منطقتك / الحي الذي تعيش فيه؟

- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
- 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
- 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 (محايد) لا أوافق ولا أعارض
- 4 Agree / 4 أوافق
- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

38. In your opinion the aid intervention strengthened the feelings of cooperation, support and solidarity with fellow Lebanese and non-Lebanese citizens in your area/neighborhood.

هل برأيك ساهمت المساعدة في تعزيز مشاعر التعاون والدعم والتضامن مع اللبنانيين وغير اللبنانيين في منطقتك؟

- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
- 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
- 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 (محايد) لا أوافق ولا أعارض
- 4 Agree / 4 أوافق
- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

39. In your opinion the aid intervention was distributed equally among PoBB?

هل برأيك تم توزيع المساعدات بشكلٍ عادل بين المتضررين من إنفجار مرفأ بيروت؟

- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
- 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
- 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 (محايد) لا أوافق ولا أعارض
- 4 Agree / 4 أوافق
- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

40. In your opinion the aid intervention included minority groups and individuals (ethnic, religious, handicapped, women)

هل برأيك شملت المساعدات الأقليات والأفراد (حسب العرق، الطائفة، أصحاب الاحتياجات الخاصة، النساء)

- 1 Strongly disagree / 1 لا أوافق أبدًا
- 2 Disagree / 2 لا أوافق
- 3 Neutral (Neither agree nor disagree) / 3 (محايد) لا أوافق ولا أعارض
- 4 Agree / 4 أوافق
- 5 Strongly Agree / 5 أوافق بشدة

7. التأثير والاستدامة / Impact and Sustainability

41. Are you able to benefit from the received aid till today?

هل ما زلت تستفيد من المساعدات التي حصلت عليها حتى اليوم؟

- 1 not at all / 1 كلا على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow / 2 بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 بشكلٍ مقبول
- 4 considerably / 4 بشكلٍ كبير
- 5 all the time / 5 أغلب الوقت

42. Do you still need aid in relation to the Port of Beirut Explosion recovery?

هل ما زلت بحاجة الى مساعدة فيما يتعلق بالتعافي من أضرار انفجار مرفأ بيروت؟

- Yes / نعم
- No / كلا

43. If yes, what kind of help was needed? [check box]

إذا كانت الإجابة نعم، فما نوع المساعدة المطلوبة؟ [اختر الخانة المناسبة]

- psychosocial support, / دعم نفسي واجتماعي
- healthcare, / رعاية صحية
- education, / تعليم
- renovation, / ترميم
- housing, / إسكان
- cash, / أموال نقدية
- food, / مواد غذائية
- WASH (water sanitation and hygiene) / (مواد تنظيف وتعقيم المياه والنظافة العامة)
- Employment / فرصة عمل
- In Kind Grant / مساعدة عينية
- Other / غير ذلك _____

44. If the received aid is renovation/construction of a business, ask, did the Appeal contribute to economic recovery of your business?

إذا كانت المساعدة المستلمة عبارة عن ترميم / بناء مركز عمل، هل ساهمت المساعدة في إنعاش وضع عملك الاقتصادي؟

- 1 not at all / 1 كلا على الإطلاق
- 2 somehow / 2 بعض الشيء
- 3 acceptable / 3 بشكلٍ مقبول

- 4 considerably / 4 بشكٍ كبير
- 5 definitely / 5 بالتأكيد

45. Do you have any negative feedback on any of the aid providers?

هل لديك أي تعليقات سلبية على أي من مقدمي المساعدات؟

- No / كلا
- Yes / نعم

46. If yes explain please, / إذا كانت الإجابة نعم، يرجى تحديدها /

.....

Appendix B: Areas Where Aid Was Received

Area where aid was received [please add all areas in the zones]		
	Frequency	Valid Percent
Achrafieh	32	12.4
Achrafieh - Sassine / Mar Mitr	2	0.8
Ain El Mreisseh	6	2.3
Bachoura	3	1.2
Badawi	10	3.9
Badawi - Geitawi	1	0.4
Bourj Hammoud	11	4.3
Daoura	7	2.7
Daoura - Karantina	1	0.4
Furn El Hayek	5	1.9
Furn El Hayek - Sassine / Mar mitr	1	0.4
Geitawi	10	3.9
Gemmayze	17	6.6
Gemmayze - Rmeil	1	0.4
Karantina	22	8.5
Khodor	7	2.7
Mar Mikhael	10	3.9
Medawar	4	1.6
Medawar - Qoubaiyat	1	0.4
Nassrah	12	4.7
Other	15	5.8
Qoubaiyat	30	11.6
Rmeil	7	2.7
Saifi	3	1.2
Sassine / Mar Mitr	12	4.7
Sodeco	8	3.1
St. Georges - Roum	7	2.7
St. Nicolas	6	2.3
Sursock	2	0.8
Zokak El Blat	5	1.9
Total	258	100

Other Specify		
	Frequency	Valid Percent
	243	94.2
Application. And z2a2 l blat	1	0.4
Bshara l khoure. x	1	0.4
Mandalon	1	0.4
Roum	3	1.2
Tabariz	8	3.1
Zaytouna bay	1	0.4
Total	258	100

The aid was received by the beneficiaries in several areas where the most frequent areas in descending order were Ashrafieh, Qoubaiyat, Karantina, Gemmayze, Nasra and Mar mkhayel.

Location where aid was received (street)		
	Frequency	Valid Percent
	4	1.6
3al bet	1	0.4
3ebrin	1	0.4
Abdul hadi	3	1.2
Abdul wahab l englize	4	1.6
Adib ishac	3	1.2
Ahmad tabbara	2	0.8
Al mahata	1	0.4
Alexandre fleming	3	1.2
Alzahhar	1	0.4
Amin el jmayel	1	0.4
Antoine azane	1	0.4
Antranic street	1	0.4
Arax	2	0.8
Armenia	13	5.0
Arz	5	1.9
Assir	1	0.4
Athena street	1	0.4

August basha	1	0.4
Baaklini street	2	0.8
Badawi	16	6.2
Baydoun	1	0.4
Blom bank	1	0.4
Borj hammoud before malaab baladi	1	0.4
Comple al abyad	1	0.4
Daoud barakat	2	0.8
Dawra	5	1.9
Eben sina	6	2.3
Ekhwen alsafa	1	0.4
El bridi	1	0.4
Elias saab	2	0.8
Eljeser	1	0.4
Furn el hayek	2	0.8
Geitawi	3	1.2
Georges hay	2	0.8
Georges tabet	1	0.4
Ghab street	1	0.4
Ghazar street	1	0.4
Ghoulem street	1	0.4
Goro	13	5.0
Gouro	1	0.4
Hajin street	2	0.8
Hay baydoun	1	0.4
Hay I serian	4	1.6
Hmede	3	1.2
Hospital Saint george	1	0.4
Independence	3	1.2
Iskandar street	1	0.4
Karabtina khodor	1	0.4
Karantina	15	5.8
Khalil badawi	2	0.8
Khodor	9	3.5
Khodor street	4	1.6
Khoury aaris	1	0.4
Knisit mar Youhanna	1	0.4

Kobayat	1	0.4
Koronfol	1	0.4
Lahoud street	2	0.8
Liban post street	1	0.4
Lies sarkis	2	0.8
Lion/medawar	1	0.4
Makbara street	1	0.4
Mar mitr street	1	0.4
Maraash	1	0.4
Mariam jehchen	1	0.4
Marssad France bank	1	0.4
Mohamad l.hout	1	0.4
Nahwr	1	0.4
Najib trad	4	1.6
Naoum labaki	1	0.4
Nassif rayes	2	0.8
Nassrah street	2	0.8
Near Saint Joseph church	1	0.4
Near sodeco	1	0.4
Nour hajin	1	0.4
Observatoire	1	0.4
Old mandaloun	1	0.4
Pasteur	7	2.7
Qobayat	1	0.4
Qobayat street	3	1.2
Raii salih	1	0.4
Raymond khalife	1	0.4
Rmeil	3	1.2
Roum	2	0.8
Roum hospital	1	0.4
Roum street ashrafieh	1	0.4
Rue flamingo	1	0.4
Rue nahar	1	0.4
Rue st nicolas	1	0.4
Saint george	1	0.4
Saint George	1	0.4
Saint georges	1	0.4

Saint Louis	2	0.8
Salam school	1	0.4
Salim slim building	1	0.4
Senegal	4	1.6
Sh7ade	1	0.4
Shebli street	1	0.4
Sheri3 sh7ade.	1	0.4
Shmaitelle	1	0.4
Shmaytelli	8	3.1
Sirsock	1	0.4
St nicolas	3	1.2
Street 63 Saint George hospital	1	0.4
Tabariz	1	0.4
Toufic rizk	1	0.4
Trad	3	1.2
Wadi3 n3im	2	0.8
X	2	0.8
Z2a2 I blat. Sheri3 yousef I asir	1	0.4
Zahrani street	1	0.4
Zahrit el ehsan	2	0.8
b Block building barteniss 2nd مساكن الارمن gate	1	0.4
مساكن شعبيه	2	0.8
Total	258	100