VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT
OF SYRIAN REFUGEES IN EGYPT 2016
Cover Photo: Mahmoud relies on food vouchers from WFP and financial assistance from UNHCR to support his wife and daughter. © UNHCR/Scott Nelson/November 2014.
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Syrian refugees have sought safe haven in Egypt for seven years, since the onset of war. There are now 500,000 Syrians residing in Egypt according to government estimates, and by large they have been treated fairly and with respect by the Egyptian government and citizens. In December 2016, 116,013 Syrian refugees were registered with the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR). Nonetheless, the protracted nature of the war, together with major structural changes to Egypt’s economy have increased risk factors for refugees. Following the implementation of the recent economic and financial reforms and the floatation of the Egyptian Pound, inflation in the overall Consumer Price Index reached 29.6 per cent at the beginning of 2017. Moreover, inflation in the Food Price Index reached a historic peak of 38.6 per cent, all of which led to increased pressures on households to meet basic needs of food and non-food items. The humanitarian assistance delivered is essential to address dramatic increases in the vulnerability of Syrian refugees.

The findings of the 2016 Egypt Vulnerability Assessment (EVAR), a comprehensive multi-sector household-level survey of 23,345 Syrian refugee households in Egypt, are presented in this report, which builds upon similar data collected in 2014/2015 to produce a longitudinal perspective that allows for the identification of important patterns. The quantitative nature of the results are triangulated with qualitative data gleaned from 59 focus group discussions undertaken as part of UNHCR’s 2016 Participatory Assessment. Together, the data presented in this report permits humanitarian actors to better identify vulnerabilities and capacities, understand the patterns and relations between variables that affect vulnerability, and ultimately generate sustainable programmes that reduce vulnerability and increase the protection and self-reliance of refugees.

This report demonstrates that challenges for Syrian refugees in Egypt have increased since the onset of the crisis. Refugee household expenditures have increased significantly; personal debt has increased; and financial assets have decreased. Food consumption and food security are below acceptable standards for many refugee households. In addition, the data indicates that difficulties Syrian refugees face in accessing formal labour markets are a major contributor towards their increasing vulnerability.

1 Quarterly Labour Survey, CAPMAS.
KEY FINDINGS

DEMOGRAPHICS

Over half of the Syrian refugee population resides in Greater Cairo. The vast majority arrived during 2012 and 2013, however, in 2016 the number of refugees arriving from Syria more than doubled from the previous year at 16,698 people. At the end of 2016, there were 116,013 Syrian refugees registered with UNHCR Egypt, with the male to female ratio being roughly equal. The average household size is four persons, with 20 per cent of households being female-headed.

RESIDENCE PERMITS

To a great extent, Egyptian residence permits facilitate the lives of refugees by permitting access to basic and social services, such as health care and education. Despite that, only 49 per cent of Syrian refugees hold a valid residence permit, which is a worrisome decrease from 58 per cent the year before. The permit’s short validity period of six months, delays caused by a cumbersome bureaucratic process, and the costs associated with acquiring the permit including high transporation costs from the governorate of residence to Mogamma were all identified by refugees as causal factors leading to low acquisition and retention rates. As such, UNHCR will continue its work in strengthening national capacity, enhancing support to obtain birth certificates, advocating for facilitating access to residence permits, continuing to provide targeted support for refugees and disseminating information about the importance of permits.

CHILDREN-AT-RISK

The protection of children is a key priority. By the end of 2016, a total of 678 children were identified as either unaccompanied or separated from their parents; while 137 children were exposed to early marriage. Additionally, 7 per cent of surveyed children were found to be engaging in child labour, a large increase as compared to 2.7 per cent in 2015. Five per cent of these working children engage in high-risk, exploitative, and/or illegal jobs as an emergency coping strategy. Half of the children working do not attend school. UNHCR is committed to strengthening its already robust child protection programming, which includes comprehensive prevention and response services for children and their families.

EDUCATION

Syrian refugees have full access to the Egyptian public education system on an equal footing as Egyptians. Eighty two per cent of Syrian refugee children attend school; of whom more than 87 per cent attend public schools. Nonetheless, 18 per cent of children do not attend school on a regular basis, which is an increase from 15 per cent in 2015, due to the cost of schooling, lack of documentation, and on-going registration issues. Given the challenges identified, which include reports of discrimination in school, UNHCR will continue to facilitate peaceful coexistence interventions between refugee and host communities, while efforts at facilitating access and retention of residence permits will strengthen access to education.

FOOD SECURITY

The World Food Programme (WFP) reports that 15 per cent of Syrian refugees have food consumption levels that are far below the minimum acceptable diet; and 29.8 per cent have borderline food consumption levels that barely meet their needs. This indicates that nearly half of the Syrian refugee population has poor food consumption or is vulnerable to having poor food consumption. Forty-nine
per cent of the population has low or medium dietary diversity, which may be used as proxy indicator of nutrient adequacy. Forty five per cent of the population is severely to moderately food insecure, meaning that there are extreme to significant food consumption gaps and/or coping strategies for meeting food consumption needs. WFP food vouchers have a net positive effect on food security, but contributing factors rooted in livelihood opportunities must and will be addressed by UNHCR and its partners through innovative self reliance programmes.

INCOME, EXPENDITURES, GAPS, AND VULNERABILITIES

Syrian refugee households are dependent on multi-purpose cash grants and food vouchers, with 52 per cent of the population receiving food vouchers from WFP, and 40 per cent receiving multi-purpose cash assistance from UNHCR. This assistance represents 59 per cent of total household income. Only 38 per cent of the surveyed population reported to be economically active, with large gender imbalances. Seventy eight per cent of the working males have regular work, as opposed to 12 per cent among females, of whom the majority are self-employed. Monthly per capita expenditures increased by 20 per cent in 2016 with food and rent comprising 80 per cent of total monthly expenditures. In order to address gaps in household cash flow, 86 per cent of households borrow money, which has resulted in 73 per cent of households being in debt. More worrying still is a significant decrease in savings and assets as compared to previous years, indicating that households are depleting their resources during their stay in Egypt. Overall, 51 per cent of Syrian refugee households are severely vulnerable, with predicted expenditure per capita less than half the calculated Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB). Almost 30 per cent of households are highly vulnerable, with a predicted expenditure below the MEB.

LIVELIHOODS

Of the entire working age refugee population, 62 per cent are not working, signifying that only 38 per cent of the population are economically active. Among the employed, 71 per cent of males, and 50 per cent of females are employed as manual labourers in the service and trades sector, the largest sector for both genders. A high number of Syrian refugees report being unable to find regular jobs due to a lack of employment opportunities. For women, family responsibilities and cultural traditions discourage them from finding work. UNHCR and partners will collect more detailed information on cultural values and family responsibilities in order to generate culturally appropriate livelihoods responses. Concurrently, as reported by Syrian refugees, family and community networks are the most common means of finding employment; hence, it is vital for UNHCR and partners to support and augment these networks.
INTRODUCTION

RATIONALE AND BACKGROUND

The refugee situation caused by over seven years of conflict in Syria is dire. Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, and Turkey host close to 4.8 million registered Syrian refugees, and Syrians are seeking protection outside these countries as well. The Government of Egypt (GoE) estimates that there are around 500,000 Syrians living in Egypt. At the end of December 2016, 116,013 Syrians were registered with UNHCR, of which 12,621 arrived in Egypt in 2016. Additionally, refugees and asylum-seekers from over 65 countries, including Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, and Iraq are living in Egypt. This assessment concentrates on Syrian refugees, currently the largest refugee community in Egypt.

EVAR is a comprehensive multi-sector household level survey, which was developed by UNHCR in partnership with WFP, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), CARITAS Egypt, and CARITAS Alexandria. EVAR is managed by UNHCR Egypt with WFP contributing to the food security analysis. The purpose of the EVAR is to generate reliable and representative evidence on the demographic, protection, education, economic, housing and coping strategies of Syrian refugee children and adults in Egypt. The EVAR provides data that will be used by the humanitarian community to create sustainable, holistic, and participatory interventions to improve a multitude of protection interventions such as: protection assistance, education, food consumption, cash-based assistance, health, food security, livelihoods, and self-reliance. The provision of accurate data is essential to the successful development of programmatic interventions. In addition to an improved understanding of the living conditions of Syrian refugees in Egypt, a vital feature of the assessment therefore consists of identifying strategic and operational recommendations for the programmatic planning and implementation of the Syrian Refugee and Resilience plan for 2017 and 2018 (3RP).

PURPOSE

The 2016 assessment surveyed 23,345 households and builds on data sets collected in similar studies undertaken in the first cycle in 2014-2015. The Socio-Economic Assessment (SEA) undertaken in late 2014 surveyed 22,769 households, including 98,902 individuals, representing almost 90 per cent of the registered Syrian refugee population. The two sets of data collected since 2014 contribute to a longitudinal perspective which facilitates the identification of significant trends in vulnerability-related data such as detailed socioeconomic and food security data, and provides evidence and evaluative frameworks for targeting programmes. The longitudinal perspective additionally contributes to an evolving analytic framework for vulnerability, in particular regarding econometric modeling and sector level models, and data profiling. Finally, multi-year data sets facilitate the identification of areas where further data collection and analysis is necessary.

The findings of this assessment must be understood within the context of a fluid Egyptian political and economic discourse. Since November 2016, there have been critical changes in the Egyptian economic landscape with the initiation of a major economic reform programme, including the liberalization of the exchange rate, fiscal consolidation measures and reforms to the business environment, as well as the lifting of subsidies on food, consumables, water, and electricity. Additionally, increasing living costs, overstretched services, and rising levels of unemployment have a two-fold negative impact on vulnerable Syrian refugees; first by directly increasing their economic vulnerability, and second because of the pressure on the hospitality of Egyptian communities, whose resources are increasingly stretched.

---


OBJECTIVES

EVAR is an extension of data collected previously (2014-2015), and analysis has been conducted by UNHCR and WFP (food security). It is a comprehensive multi-sectoral household level survey that builds on previously collected data.

EVAR aims to:

a) Assess the general vulnerability and food security situation of the Syrian refugees in Egypt one year after the last survey in 2015;

b) Estimate the degree and type of vulnerability pertaining to the Syrian refugee population in Egypt;

c) Update the vulnerability profile of the Syrian refugee population to support targeting of the population in need, and;

d) Identify areas where further data collection and analysis is necessary.

This full-scale second assessment was conducted in order to identify and analyze the main changes in the living conditions and the different types and levels of vulnerabilities of Syrian refugees in Egypt compared to the previous year, as well as trends and leading factors that resulted in these changes.

The study draws conclusions and recommendations. The analysis of the report was carried out by UNHCR for the demographics, protection, education, income, expenditure, vulnerability and coping strategies, and livelihoods chapters while WFP conducted analysis for the food security chapter.

Abdel Hadi has recently opened sandwich shop in Agamy, Alexandria. © UNHCR/Scott Nelson/December 2017.
EGYPT’S VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT ADVISORY GROUP

The EVAR Advisory Group was established in early 2016 to improve the assessment and analysis of the EVAR and provide technical expertise and guidance on the application of analysis to inform assistance for Syrian refugees in Egypt. The Advisory Group is composed of representatives from UNHCR (Chair), WFP, UNICEF, CARITAS Cairo, and CARITAS Alexandria, and plays a key role in ensuring the participation of multiple stakeholders, which creates a more holistic and robust approach to project planning and implementation.

The Advisory Group’s main responsibilities are to provide feedback on the goals, objectives, strategies, and the implementation of the EVAR data collection process. Additionally, the Advisory Group reviews and advises on multi-sector vulnerability indicators and models, endorses the EVAR questionnaire, identifies and assists in addressing specific gaps or challenges requiring review, ensures that age and gender diversity are adequately represented and integrated, advises on the assessment implementation, and ensures stakeholder accessibility to collected data.

POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The EVAR was launched in April 2016 and was completed in January 2017. During this period, the assessment surveyed 23,345 Syrian refugee households equal to 101,063 Syrian individuals. The female-male ratio is 50-50. With regard to the female population, 22 per cent are under 18 years old, 26 per cent are between 18 to 60 years old, and only 2 per cent are 60 years and above.

*A household is defined as an economic unit, where resources are pooled and shared, and there is generally one decision maker for all major economic decisions (especially regarding spending and saving). It should be noted, however, that living arrangements and familial relations are not part of the definition of a household. As such, living in, or sharing the same space unit (same house, same apartment), does not necessarily entail being part of the same household; people living together could be part of different households. Similarly, members of the same household may be relatives or not.*

METHODOLOGY

Amina and her husband are preparing Syrian food in a rented small apartment where they established their food business. © UNHCR/Hossam Horus/January 2017.
Figure 1. Percentage of questionnaires completed per governorate

Regarding the male population, 23 per cent are under 18 years old, 24 per cent are between 18 and 60 years old, while 3 per cent are 60 years and above.

Eighty-seven per cent of the UNHCR-registered Syrian refugee population participated in the EVAR. Figure 1 above reflects the percentage of questionnaires completed per governorate. Syrians that arrived in 2016 who were registered with UNHCR until November 2016 and were reachable are included in the assessment. Syrian refugees living in Suez and Upper Egypt were requested to come to CARITAS office (only those able to do so are included). Very few Syrian refugees refused to participate.

The food security module assessment is implemented on a subset of the total number of registered Syrian refugees in Egypt. A sample of 3,545 households from Greater Cairo, Alexandria, and Damietta were selected using “stratified random sampling,” using three stratification criteria: (a) family size, (b) households with and without WFP assistance and, (c) geographic location. The sampling frame includes only districts with fairly large concentrations of Syrian refugees, ≥ 100 refugee households (with and without food voucher or multi-purpose cash assistance). The sample was developed using proportional random sampling. The level of accuracy is 95 per cent, with a prevalence rate assumed of 50 per cent, and a 10 per cent non-response rate.
EVAR QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire deployed for the 2014 and 2015 SEA was developed by UNHCR in consultation with WFP, UNICEF, and Save the Children International (SCI), as well as with UNHCR Egypt’s partner, CARITAS Egypt. Together, these stakeholders developed a standardized questionnaire based on similar assessments performed by UNHCR in Lebanon and Jordan. In order to improve the first SEA and to ensure the effectiveness of the data to a range of stakeholders, the 2016 EVAR questionnaire was updated by UNHCR, WFP, and CARITAS based on lessons learned from the SEA. The EVAR questionnaire addresses important multi-sector indicators, while aiming to limit the interview time to one hour. It includes key information on household demographics, refugee’s profile on arrival, registration information, protection and security concerns, productive assets, education levels, livelihoods strategies, revenue and expenditures, food consumption, coping strategies, debts, and assistance provided (See Annex 1 for the EVAR questionnaire). The questionnaire also includes a section for observations and referral to services for the most vulnerable by the enumerators.

DATA COLLECTION

CARITAS Cairo and CARITAS Alexandria, UNHCR’s partners, conducted all assessments for the EVAR. CARITAS conducted home-based assessments for all households in Alexandria and Damietta and 80 per cent of the assessments in Cairo; the remaining assessments in Cairo were conducted at the CARITAS office in Nasr City, Cairo. Office-based interviews were conducted as an alternative to home-based assessments in cases where home visits were not permitted due to security concerns. Home visits, although more time consuming, allow for the collection of more data as they include both responses to questions as well as information collected through observable indicators.

Home and office-based interviews were undertaken by a team of two CARITAS enumerators (one male and one female). Interviewers were trained to ask the questions verbatim and be conscious of avoiding subjective interpretation of both questions and answers. In both styles of interview, the tablet-based questionnaire was completed by one enumerator, while the other asked questions and completed a paper form. Results recorded on the tablet were cross-checked with the paper-based questionnaires by data reviewers, and checked for completeness, correctness, integrity, and consistency according to data review guidelines shared by UNHCR. Where necessary, clarifications were requested and corrections were made accordingly. The uploaded data was then verified by an automated software validation tool designed by UNHCR to perform logical checks and flag errors in the data.

Additional qualitative data was collected during UNHCR’s Participatory Assessment conducted in 2016 and January 2017. During the first two months of 2016, UNHCR Egypt conducted 59 meetings with various groups of refugees and asylum-seekers based on geographical location and nationality with the aim of gaining a deeper understanding of the challenges they face in Egypt. The Participatory Assessment employed the UNHCR Tool for Participatory Assessment in Operations. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews with focus groups to gain a broad array of community perspectives, and to create a forum for refugees to bring to light any new concerns or trends important to their communities.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis followed the analytic framework developed for the 2014-2015 assessment. This framework is based upon an econometric model, the so-called “poverty model” that predicts households’ monthly expenditure, with welfare measured according to predicted expenditure per capita net of assistance received. Data has been cross-checked against the UNHCR ProGres

---

Household vulnerability is assessed against four thresholds, designating severe, high, mild, and low vulnerability. Those households in the severe and high-vulnerability groups are unable to meet the minimum expenditure basket (MEB) defined as the minimum quantities of basic food and non-food items needed for a Syrian household in Egypt to maintain a basic but dignified life. In addition to the MEB, the analysis in this report includes calculations of indicators such as dependency ratio, crowding index, food consumption score, and coping strategies classification.

In 2014, UNHCR Egypt developed the MEB for Syrian refugees in Egypt, which is derived from a series of focus group discussions with Syrian refugees to determine their main expenditures. This was followed by a market assessment in Alexandria, Cairo, and Damietta to quantify the data. The MEB for 2014 was calculated as EGP 592.4 (USD 79) per person per month. The MEB remained at the same level for 2016 based on the Central Bank of Egypt’s statistic and inflation rates. However, following the devaluation of the Egyptian Pound in late November 2016, the MEB for December onwards increased for both food vouchers and multipurpose cash assistance.

For the purpose of the analysis in the report, the MEB of EGP 592.4 has been used, since the majority of the data collection is based on the first 10 months of the year. For this purpose, UNHCR has adapted the following vulnerability thresholds for net expenditure per capita:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability Threshold</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe vulnerability</td>
<td>&lt; 50% of the MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High vulnerability</td>
<td>51-99% of the MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild vulnerability</td>
<td>100-149% of the MEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vulnerability</td>
<td>&gt;150% of the MEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIMITATIONS**

The majority of data presented in this report is derived from the Alexandria, Delta Region, and Greater Cairo Governorates, the governorates with the highest Syrian refugee populations. In governorates with smaller numbers of refugees, such as those in Upper Egypt and Suez, home visits were not conducted. Rather, refugees were requested to visit the CARITAS office. Therefore, there are limits on the representative nature of the data for those governorates.

The majority of interviews (80 per cent) were conducted through household visits, and 20 per cent took place at the offices of CARITAS, either because the areas were not secure enough to visit, or refugees were living in distant governorates. This limited the ability to verify some of the information collected, since visual verification was not feasible. Data collected on refugees living in the more distant governorates is under-represented, since only 26 per cent of the households were interviewed.

There continues to be challenges with the definition of the household. Refugees’ lives are often in flux and the constitution of households changes over time, often with new members coming from Syria. In other cases, while families may share the same roof and food, they function as separate households, managing their own budget for other expenses.

---

6 ProGres is UNHCR’s comprehensive database for individual and continuous registration of asylum-seekers, refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR.
DEMographics

gEOgraphICAL DISTRIBUTION

Over half (56 per cent) of the Syrian refugee population in Egypt resides in the Greater Cairo region, with the majority residing in 6th of October City, Al Obour, and East Nasr city. Alexandria, Egypt’s second largest city, hosts almost 21 per cent of the Syrian refugee population, while Damietta, in the Delta region, hosts the third largest population of Syrian refugees representing 9 per cent of the total registered Syrian population in Egypt. Sharkia hosts 6 per cent of the total Syrian population, in particular in the 10th of Ramadan City, an industrial area where refugees are able to find employment. See Map 1.

Map 1. Syrians registered with UNHCR per governorate in Egypt

Household Size and Composition

UNHCR Egypt started registering Syrian refugees fleeing the conflict in Syria in 2011. The majority of them arrived in Egypt in 2012 and 2013.

Figure 2. Syrians registered with UNHCR by year of arrival
At the end of December 2016, 116,013 Syrian refugees were registered with UNHCR Egypt. The registered population was concentrated in the big urban areas, with 21,365 Individuals in Alexandria, Matrouh and El-Beheira, 23,785 in the Delta region, 67,140 in Greater Cairo, and 3,723 individuals in Upper Egypt and the Suez Canal region.

The largest average Syrian refugee household size was recorded in Damietta, with 4.5 individuals per household, followed by Cairo at 4.4 individuals, and Alexandria at 4 individuals per household. Across all regions, the average number of households has 2.19 adults aged (18-60), 0.67 children aged (0-5), 1.25 children aged (6-16), and 0.21 elderly persons aged above 60.

The population pyramid graph (Figure 3) represents the Syrian refugee population’s age distribution by gender. A stable female/male ratio at 1:1 is demonstrated. Almost half the population is composed of adults of working age (18-60), while 47 per cent of the population is composed of children 17 years old and below. Five per cent of the population is above 60 years.

Most Syrian refugees live in urban areas, with 91 per cent living in apartments, of whom 55 per cent are renting an unfurnished apartment. Only 0.5 per cent of the Syrian refugees own their own apartment. Around 7 per cent of Syrian households reported that they are not paying any rent.

**Figure 3. Age distribution by gender**
HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

Over 90 per cent of households are headed by an adult aged between 18 and 60 years old while 8 per cent are headed by an adult aged 60 and above and 0.4 per cent of households are headed by unaccompanied children. Twenty per cent of households are headed by a female and 80 per cent are households headed by a male.

There is no significant difference in the level of education between male and female heads of households. Thirty two per cent of female-headed households completed secondary education or above compared to 30 per cent of male-headed households.

Table 2. Level of education of female and male-headed households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None /KG</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hala draws Mandala as a hobby and wants to turn into a career. © UNHCR/ David Degner/March 2017.
GOVERNORATES OF ORIGIN

Syrian refugees residing in Egypt originate mainly from Damascus and its rural suburbs, representing 32 per cent and 30 per cent of the population respectively. Syrian refugees coming from Aleppo represent about 14.5 per cent, followed by 12.6 per cent from Homs (see Map 2). Syrian refugees from these regions settle in all urban areas in Egypt as reflected in Figure 4.

Map 2. Governorates of origin for Syrian refugees in Egypt
SPECIFIC NEEDS

For the purpose of this report, the term "specific needs" refers to household members reporting to have someone with (i) a physical or mental disability, (ii) chronic illness, (iii) temporary illness or injury, (iv) single parent or, (v) children under long-term mental or physical treatment.7

The most commonly identified specific need is related to disability. Fourteen per cent of surveyed households report having a member in their household with a disability and 4 per cent of assessed individuals report being disabled. This includes physical and mental disabilities (60 per cent), hearing impairments (14 per cent), sight impairments (18 per cent), and speech impairments (8 per

---

7 The reported levels of medical need and disability are self-reported by the refugees and are not necessarily clinically diagnosed. Enumerators were not trained to assess medical and disability needs, and health professionals did not verify reported challenges.
Having a chronic illness is reported by 9 per cent of the population, and 3 per cent of the population identify as a single parent. Importantly, according to the assessment, 4.4 per cent of the population aged under 18 (1012 children) undergo long-term medical treatment.

HEALTH ACCESS AND UTILIZATION

A Health Access and Utilization Survey (HAUS)\(^8\) conducted by UNHCR in 2016 for Syrian refugees shows that refugees have a very high health care utilization rate. However, knowledge of their right to free or subsidized health care at governmental facilities is low. As such, while their health care seeking behaviour is very high, it is also very costly, being reliant mainly (64 per cent) on private doctors, clinics, and hospitals. Governmental facilities are less regularly utilized, with only 18 per cent of the Syrians frequenting these facilities. This is despite having to pay six times more for private services.

Nearly three quarters of all families spend an average of 735 Egyptian pounds per month on health care, with the highest bills attributed to private clinics and hospitals. The HAUS also reveals that 39 per cent of surveyed families self-reported non-communicable diseases, with hypertension, diabetes, and heart disease topping the list.

UNHCR and partners, with the support of the Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP), are working to improve the quality of public health services offered at the primary health care level. Furthermore, UNHCR and partners engage actively with communities to influence their health-seeking behaviour to shift it towards the utilization of public health facilities, rather than expensive private health clinics. Community health outreach programmes also contribute to enhancing health awareness and increased demand for MoHP primary preventative health care services.

\(^8\) UNHCR, 2016. Health Access and Utilization Survey among Syrian Refugees- Egypt. UNHCR.
PROTECTION

The Arab Republic of Egypt is signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, as well as the regional OAU 1969 Refugee Convention. The 1954 MoU signed between the GoE and UNHCR delegates the registration, documentation and refugee status determination procedures to UNHCR.

BIRTH REGISTRATIONS

Registering births with the appropriate authorities in the country of birth and eventually of nationality is both a legal obligation and an important protection tool. A birth certificate is an official document that establishes the existence of the child under the law. Failing to register the birth may have long lasting consequences on the life of the child, including the enjoyment of rights and related services, and risking the perils of statelessness.

Out of the 4,803 children born in Egypt, only the parents of 988 children responded to the question on whether their child has a birth certificate. Out of these, 97 per cent of the children were reported to have a birth certificate. The interviewers did no verification. The UNHCR ProGres database shows that 2,470 Syrian refugee children were born in 2016. Of these 2016 newborns, 83 per cent have a birth certificate and 93 per cent have a birth certificate or birth notification from the hospital.

SAFETY, REGISTRATION AND DOCUMENTATION

Syrian refugees registered with UNHCR receive an asylum-seeker card, also known as a “yellow card,” which is valid for 18 months. This card is an important proof of registration with UNHCR and can facilitate access to a residence permit. The Immigration Department of Egypt is responsible for the issuance and extension of residence permits, which are valid for a six-month period. The short duration of the document as well as delays related to the bureaucratic process have been identified as problematic by asylum-seekers and refugees during the annual participatory assessments conducted in 2016 and 2017.

The EVAR demonstrates that 49 per cent of Syrian refugees have a valid residence permit compared to 58 per cent in the year before. Some Syrian refugees (36 per cent) acquired a residence permit in order to access educational facilities, as Syrian children require both a valid residence permit as well as an asylum-seeker card (e.g. the UNHCR registration document) or a Syrian passport in order to enrol in public schools. Other reasons for acquiring a residence permit include: the need to formalize the stay in Egypt, to access basic and social services, to secure an exit clearance out of Egypt without irregular or late stay penalties, and by means of indicating where one was upon return to the country of origin.

The lack of valid legal residence permits continues to be a protection concern and UNHCR continues to inform refugees about the importance of residency acquisition and timely renewals. Challenges related to the process including travel expenses for refugees living outside Cairo precludes many refugees from applying for the permits. UNHCR continues to advocate on behalf of refugees and provides support where obstacles are faced in the issuing of residence permits.

According to UNHCR ProGres data, the number of Syrian refugees approaching UNHCR for registration increased from 4,262 in 2015 to 12,097 in 2016. This includes 3,119 Syrians that had been in Egypt before. Concurrently, the number of Syrian refugees spontaneously returning back to Syria from Egypt decreased from 521 in 2015 to 295 in 2016. It is important to take note that this data only reflects those that have informed UNHCR of their return to Syria.
PHYSICAL SAFETY

The Participatory Assessments conducted in 2016 revealed that street insecurity is the most severe protection problem identified by refugees. Eighty five per cent of participants from different age groups and nationalities, including Syrians, reported experiencing incidents in Greater Cairo’s streets such as: verbal and physical harassment, insults, threats, abduction, kidnapping, robbery, extortion, mugging, miscellaneous attacks, looting, and rape attempts. These acts of violence not only represent a degree of discrimination (gender, age, religion, nationality), which refugees have to contend with on a daily basis, but also imply the necessity of interacting with police to address the acts, which refugees indicate is difficult and contentious.

Along with the security threats related to street insecurity, women and children face problems directly related to their physical safety. Young Syrian girls and women report of sexual harassment while using public transportation, taxies, and rickshaw vehicles, by drivers or other passengers.
SYRIAN REFUGEE CHILDREN AT RISK

The protection of children remains a key priority, and UNHCR Egypt works hard to address the immediate and longer-term needs of Syrian refugee children. According to the UNHCR ProGres database (end of 2016), among children at risk, 678 were either unaccompanied or separated from their parents. UNHCR child protection programming focuses in particular on the strengthening of the protection of vulnerable children through a comprehensive prevention and response service including case management, specialized and non-specialized community-based protection services, awareness raising and outreach to the community, and strengthening of national child protection systems and capacity building. Best interest procedures remain a key intervention tool to prevent, identify, and address child protection needs and associated risks affecting the most vulnerable, in particular those exposed to violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

In 2016, UNHCR also identified 137 Syrian children (eight were males) who had been exposed to early marriage. Early marriage is a form of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and once identified, UNHCR and partners provide counselling to child spouses and families, and follow-up in an attempt to mitigate additional risks. UNHCR and partners are rolling out prevention activities to prevent early marriage in accordance with the Government of Egypt's strategy for combating childhood marriages.

CHILD LABOUR

The fragile economic situation in Egypt has impacted the already limited access of refugees to the formal employment market, and has resulted in the increase of families exposed to the risk of poverty and their subsequent reliance upon humanitarian assistance. With limited sustainable employment opportunities for adult family members, families have plunged deeper into poverty, and children often feel compelled to find work to support and sustain their families. This often leaves children susceptible to abuse, violence, and exploitation as they engage in hazardous forms of labour in the informal sector and subsequently drop out of school. The assessment demonstrates that 7 per cent of children reported involvement in child labour (see Figure 5). Out of the working children population, the majority are boys and only 3 per cent are girls. Sixty-two per cent of working children are boys between 15 and 18.

The number of children involved in child labour increased from 2.7 per cent in 2014/2015 to 7 per cent in the 2016 EVAR. Five per cent of children involved in child labour are engaged in high-risk, exploitative, and/or illegal jobs as an emergency coping strategy. Half of working children do not attend school at all.

Figure 5. Child labour per age category
Children mainly work in restaurants, in retails, or as manufacturing labourers in factories (see Figure 6). Five percent work in the street. Sixty-three percent of working children report working more than 43 hours per week, 28 per cent report working between 14 and 43 hours per week, while 9 per cent report working less than 14 hours per week. The working conditions (Figure 7) are very poor, with many children being exposed to dangerous activities under difficult circumstances.

UNHCR and partners provide counseling and support for children and families engaged in child labour including referral to case management, medical assistance, cash-based interventions, psychosocial support, and community-based protection activities.
EDUCATION

Syrian refugees in Egypt have access to the Egyptian public education system. In order to enrol in public schools, Syrian children require either a UNHCR registration card or a Syrian passport, and must also have a valid Egyptian residence permit. Syrians have been granted access to higher education, although current requirements for admission remain an obstacle for many students as they are requested to submit a secondary school certificate to enrol in Egyptian universities.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

The public education system in Egypt consists of four levels: kindergarten (three years) for children aged three to five years old, primary school (six years) for those aged six to 11 years of age, preparatory school (three years) for those aged 12 to 14 years, and secondary school (three years) for those aged 15 to 17 years.

According to EVAR data, 26 per cent of Syrian refugee children between the age of three and five years old attend kindergarten. The percentage of enrolment at the age of three is just under 10 per cent; it increases to 22 per cent at four years old, and by the age of five it reaches 41 per cent.

The percentage of children attending school peaks between the ages of eight and 11, with an enrolment rate exceeding 90 per cent. These rates start to drop as of 12 years old and continue to drop precipitously until it reaches 52 per cent enrolment as of age 17 (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Percentage of children attending school from 8 to 17 years old

In total, 81 per cent of Syrian refugee children under 18 years old attend school. Slightly more girls (82 per cent) attend school as compared to 80 per cent of boys (Table 3).
Table 3. Number of children under 18 years attending school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending School</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to school</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regionally, Sharkia is the governorate with the highest percentage of school-age children attending school with 92 per cent. Monofiya follows with 91 per cent. In terms of children not attending school, the governorates with the highest number of out-of-school children are Giza (26 per cent), followed by Cairo (25 per cent), Qalyubia (23 per cent), and Alexandria (22 per cent) (Figure 9).

Eighty seven per cent of surveyed Syrian refugees use their right to education to access national public schools. Furthermore, 9 per cent of surveyed Syrian children who are attending school attend Syrian community schools. Four per cent attend private schools, of which only 0.26 per cent attend private special needs schools. Regionally, the areas with the highest number of Syrian refugee children attending Syrian community schools are Qalyubia (24 per cent) and 6th of October City (18 per cent). Giza has the highest percentage of students (17 per cent) attending private schools, followed by Cairo (12 per cent), and Alexandria (5 per cent) (Figure 10).
PRIMARY SCHOOL

The attendance rate for refugee children in primary school between the ages of 6-14 years is 85 per cent. Refugee children in school face a myriad of challenges to advance at the same rate as their local classmates. Elevated standards at Egyptian schools present difficulties for Syrian refugees as does the Egyptian dialect and curriculum, together with overcrowded classrooms. Figure 11 demonstrates that 70 per cent of children aged between 12 and 14, who are expected to be in preparatory school, are still attending primary school. This may perhaps be attributed to having had to flee their homes and thus not attending school for a number of years. This figure decreases to 46 per cent by the age of 13, and drops to 25 per cent at the age of 14. The percentage of males and females attending primary school is almost the same with 85 per cent for males and almost 86 per cent for females.

Figure 11. Age of children at primary and preparatory school

The results of UNHCR’s participatory assessment (2016) showed mixed views on the educational opportunities available to Syrian refugees. The overall perception of refugees is that while access to education is granted in principle, many de facto barriers still remain, which deprive refugees and asylum-seekers from accessing educational opportunities. Barriers include the lack of documentation that prevents Syrian children from enrolling in schools, and households’ limited financial resources, which is the main constraint hindering children’s ability to attend school. Another obstacle uncovered during the focus group discussions in 2016 relates to perceived protection issues in community schools as they are often located in neglected neighbourhoods that may expose children to harassment on their way to and from school.

SECONDARY SCHOOL

The overall secondary school attendance rate for Syrian children aged 15 to 17 is 62 per cent. Taking into account that 68 per cent of children aged 15 attend preparatory school rather than secondary school, the number of children enrolled in secondary school is low. This percentage decreases to 51 per cent at the age of 16, yet the lag persists until the age of 18 with almost 30
per cent of young adults pursuing studies in preparatory school. Attendance in technical schools is extremely low (Figure 12). The attendance rate of boys in secondary education is 60 per cent, which is slightly less than girls (65 per cent).

**Figure 12. Level of school for children in the ages from 15 until 18 years**

![Level of school for children in the ages from 15 until 18 years](image)

**Children Out of School**

For the 19 per cent of the children who are out of school, a number of challenges exist. The cost of education is the number one reason parents don’t send their children to school. Difficulties with school registration affects 22 per cent of children, and the lack of a valid residence permit affects 19 per cent of children. These reasons affect girls and boys equally.

**Figure 13. Reasons for not attending school**

![Reasons for not attending school](image)

Of the 19 per cent of children not attending schools, there is a direct correlation between the cost of school and attendance rates in relation to the four vulnerability groups identified in the EVAR. Non-attendance for those in the severe and high vulnerability groups is over 70 per cent and 24 per cent respectively. In the mild and low vulnerability groups, these numbers drop significantly to 5 per cent and 1 per cent respectively. In total, 94 per cent of those children not attending school are in the severe and high vulnerability groups (Table 4).
PROMOTIONAL EDUCATION GRANTS

For the school year 2015/2016, UNHCR and its education partner, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), assisted 18,108 Syrian refugee children enrolled in public schools with education grants to promote access to education. The education grants contribute to school fees, school uniforms, books, stationery, and transportation. Each student receives 1,400 Egyptian Pounds. The first installment of the grant is disbursed at the beginning of the school year while the second and final installments are received upon presenting attendance records provided by the school administration. This requirement aims to improve attendance rates amongst refugee students. Children from destitute families who, even with the grant provided, are unable to afford to pay their school fees, may access additional support on a case-by-case basis (additionally assistance ranges between 500 and 900 EGP depending on needs). Additionally, 109 children with special needs are supported with education grants to cover their expenses in special needs schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Thresholds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Vulnerability</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Vulnerability</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Vulnerability</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Vulnerability</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Out of school percentages per vulnerability category
FOOD SECURITY\(^9\)

This section provides a brief overview of the food security status of Syrian refugees in Egypt with a focus on household access to food. The analysis is based on data collected during September to December 2016, for a sub-sample of 3,540 households.

Rising inflation in Egypt presents an on-going risk factor for vulnerable people’s access to food. Inflation in the Food Price Index reached a historic peak of 38.6 per cent, thus increasing pressures on households to meet their basic needs of food and non-food items.\(^{10}\) Food is, however, generally available in markets, with the exception of brief shortages in a few key commodities such as sugar, rice, and oil. A sizeable proportion of the refugee population is reliant on assistance from WFP, UNHCR, and other NGOs, and without this assistance, a large percentage of households will experience increasing challenges in meeting their essential needs. This chapter provides an overview of household access to food, including the Food Consumption Score (FCS), dietary diversity score, the frequency of adopting coping strategies, expenditure on food, and the consolidated approach for reporting indicators of food security (CARI).

FOOD CONSUMPTION

**Figure 14. Food consumption amongst Syrian refugees in Egypt**

The frequency of household food consumption\(^{11}\) of various food groups\(^{12}\) can be assessed using the FCS, which is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency, and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. Based on the analysis, households are classified into three food consumption groups, “poor,” “borderline,” and “acceptable.” The results of the EVAR sub sample show that nearly 15 per cent of Syrian refugee households have poor food consumption (far below the minimum acceptable diet), 29.8 per cent have “borderline” consumption levels, which barely meets their needs\(^{13}\) and 55 per cent have acceptable food consumption (Figure 14). This indicates that nearly half the Syrian refugee population has poor food consumption or is vulnerable to having poor food consumption.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^9\) For this chapter, data is based on a subset of the total EVAR sample, analysis was conducted by WFP.

\(^{10}\) Quarterly Labour Survey, CAPMAS.

\(^{11}\) Food frequency, in this context, is defined as the frequency (in terms of days of consumption over a reference period) that a specific food item or food group is eaten at the household level.

\(^{12}\) Food group is defined as a grouping of food items that have similar caloric and nutrient content.

\(^{13}\) The food consumption score (FCS) of a household is calculated by multiplying the frequency of foods consumed in the last seven days with the weighting of each food group. The weighting of food groups has been determined by WFP according to the nutrition density of the food group. The sum of the scores is then used to determine the FCS. The total scores are then compared to pre-established thresholds: Poor food consumption: 0 to 28, Borderline food consumption: 28.5 to 42, Acceptable food consumption: > 42.

\(^{14}\) Furthermore, on excluding “eggs” which in many other cases in the region were found to overestimate household consumption of animal protein, we find that 12.8% of households with acceptable food consumption slip into the “borderline” category which in this case increases to 36.4%.
Fifty-year-old Moazez serves dinner for her family in their rented apartment in a neighborhood in 6th of October City. © UNHCR/Shawn Baldwin/May 2013.
There are sizeable differences in food consumption scores per governorate (Figure 15). Households in Alexandria have a higher prevalence of poor food consumption compared to Cairo, Giza, and Qalyubia. Generally, more than 50 per cent of households with poor food consumption are located in Alexandria. Concurrently, Alexandria hosts approximately 23 per cent of households in the borderline food consumption category, followed by Qalyubia (19.8 per cent), Cairo (18.3 per cent), and 6th of October City (17.6 per cent).

Figure 15. Food consumption groups in six governorates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Acceptable (42- and above)</th>
<th>Borderline (28-42)</th>
<th>Poor (0-28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th of October</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalyubia</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giza</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damietta</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Geographic distribution of Syrian refugees with poor and acceptable borderline food consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cairo</th>
<th>6th of October</th>
<th>Qalyubia</th>
<th>Giza</th>
<th>Alexandria</th>
<th>Damietta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable (42 and above)</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline (28-42)</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0-28)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 The drawn sample for Alexandria represents 21.8% of the total sample whereas its share of the food poor population is 52%.
Cereals, oils, vegetables, and sugars are the four most frequently consumed foods for all groups, however, the poor and borderline food consumption groups tend to consume less of all food groups compared to households with acceptable food consumption. The variance is larger when it comes to micronutrient-rich foods and protein-rich foods like meat, dairy, pulses, and fruits (Figure 17). Half of the surveyed households did not consume meat during the reference period, 87 per cent had no fish, 20 per cent had no eggs, 58 per cent had no fruits, and 68 per cent did not consume vitamin A-rich vegetables.

**Figure 17. Food consumption pattern per food consumption group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>5.7 4.0 4.1 2.5 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>6.8 5.5 3.3 4.8 2.0 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>6.9 6.4 4.3 5.6 2.7 4.0 2.7 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>1.1 0.5 0.3 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, fish, and eggs</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average frequency rates conceal that a significant proportion of the refugees did not consume animal protein, fruits or vegetables rich in vitamin A during the reporting period; 49.7 per cent of surveyed households did not consume meat, 87 per cent had no fish, 20.2 per cent had no eggs, 57.5 per cent had no fruits and 68.2 per cent did not consume vitamin A-rich vegetables. This deprivation increases further amongst households unassisted by WFP food vouchers as shown in Figure 18.
Figure 18. Households not consuming nutrient-rich foods

Households who did not consume fish during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households who did not consume meat during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households who did not consume milk during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households who did not consume fruits during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households who did not consume eggs during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households who did not consume Vit A-Rich Veg during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assisted by WFP</th>
<th>Not Assisted by WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The food consumption patterns of children aged 6-24 months shows that households rely mainly on cereals and milk to feed their infants. The majority of surveyed infants had grains (62 per cent), and dairy products (71 per cent) during the reference period of the survey. Thirty per cent of infants had eggs, 15.6 per cent had vegetables rich in vitamin A, while merely 5.2 per cent consumed meat during the reference period.

During the reference period of the survey, about 23 per cent of households had low dietary diversity\(^\text{16}\) (i.e. their diet is based on foods from 4.5 or less food groups) while 26 per cent had medium dietary diversity (i.e. consumed foods from 5-6 food groups), and the rest had highly diversified food consumption patterns. Households with poor or borderline food consumption are more likely to have low or medium dietary diversity, compared to those with “acceptable” food consumption (Figures 19, 20).

**Figure 19. Dietary diversity pattern of food consumption groups**

![Diagram showing dietary diversity pattern](image)

**Figure 20. Distribution of Syrian refugees by dietary diversity groups**

![Diagram showing dietary diversity distribution](image)

The prevalence of poor and moderate dietary diversity varies across governorates. Alexandria has the highest prevalence of households with poor dietary diversity (25.5 per cent), followed by 6th of October City (21.5 per cent), while Damietta has the lowest prevalence of poor dietary diversity (5.4 per cent) (Figure 21).

---

\(^{16}\) Dietary diversity is defined as the number of different foods or food groups eaten over a reference time period, not regarding the frequency of consumption.
The ANOVA and Chi-square tests indicate that households receiving assistance from WFP are less likely to have poor food consumption (Figure 22).

**FOOD EXPENDITURE**

The two main sources for buying food were “household own cash” and WFP food vouchers, yet the reliance on own cash was higher. The food vouchers are used in WFP-contracted shops and are mainly used for purchasing oil, sugar, pulses, milk, meat, and eggs, rather than vegetables, fruits, and cereals. Households buy the latter from bakeries and vegetable shops instead of the WFP contracted shops.
The share of expenditure on food is commonly used as a proxy indicator that measures household economic vulnerability. Using this indicator, households are based on the share of total expenditures directed to food. The higher the share of categorized expenditure on food, the more economically vulnerable households are assumed to be. Figure 23 shows that 90 per cent of the severely food insecure spend 75 per cent or more of their total expenditure on food alone, while 86 per cent of the food secure spend less than 50 per cent of their total expenditure on food.

**Figure 23. Share of expenditure on food**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe food secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately food secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally food secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COPING STRATEGIES**

The coping strategy index measures sustainability of household food consumption and livelihoods. Households are categorized based on the severity of the coping strategies employed. The food security sub sample data shows that food consumption coping strategies are the most commonly adopted by Syrian refugees; 81 per cent of surveyed households rely on less preferred and cheaper foods to meet household food consumption needs, 63 per cent rely on limiting portions of food (moderate coping strategy), 50 per cent of households reduce adult food consumption to enable children to eat, and 28 per cent borrow food or rely on support from family and friends to buy food (Figure 24).

**Figure 24. Food consumption coping strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>% of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred foods</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit portion size per meal</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of meals / day</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict consumption of adults for children</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow food or rely on help</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households receiving food assistance from WFP are generally less reliant on food coping strategies compared to those households that do not receive assistance, as reflected in Figures 25-28.

---

17 Consolidated Approach to Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI), technical guidance note, WFP, November 2015.
The reliance on both food coping strategies and livelihood stress coping strategies increases amongst the severely and moderately food insecure, while a negligible proportion adopted emergency and crisis strategies, which are not adopted at all by the food secure. As reflected in later chapters, refugees indicate that they reduce expenditures on health and education to meet food needs.

---

18 Emergency strategies, such as selling one’s land, affect future productivity and are more difficult to reverse.

19 Crisis strategies, such as selling productive assets, directly reduce future productivity, including human capital formation.
Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators (CARI) of food security

The CARI is a composite index used as a proxy indicator for household access to food. Under the CARI approach, each surveyed household is classified into one of the four food security categories. This classification is based on the household’s current status of food security (using food consumption indicators) and their coping capacity (using indicators measuring economic vulnerability and asset depletion).\(^\text{20}\) CARI is therefore derived from the pre-reviewed indicators “food consumption score,” “share of expenditure on food,” and “livelihood based coping strategies.” Based on the derived results, households are divided into four main groups; the severely food insecure, the moderately food insecure, the marginally food secure (vulnerable population) and the food secure. Table 5 shows that 22 per cent of the Syrian households are moderately insecure, 36 per cent are marginally food secure and said to be vulnerable to food insecurity, while 0.9 per cent of the refugees are severely food insecure.

\(^\text{20}\) Ibid.
### Table 5. Food security console for Syrian Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Food Secure</th>
<th>Marginally Food Secure</th>
<th>Moderately Food Insecure</th>
<th>Severely food insecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to meet essential food and non-food needs without coping strategies</td>
<td>Has minimally adequate food consumption without engaging in irreversible coping strategies; unable to afford some essential non-food expenditures</td>
<td>Has significant food consumption gaps, OR marginally able to afford food needs only with irreversible coping strategies</td>
<td>Has extreme food consumption gaps, OR has extreme loss of livelihood assets will lead to food consumption gaps, or worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Group: frequency</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Borderline</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Expenditure Share: frequency</th>
<th>&lt;50%</th>
<th>50-65%</th>
<th>65-75%</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood coping strategy categories: frequency</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security Index</th>
<th>40.7%</th>
<th>36.0%</th>
<th>22.4%</th>
<th>0.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally Food Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The food insecure refugees generally consume less of all food groups (compared to the food secure), but, as demonstrated in Figure 29, they consume dramatically less meat, milk and dairy, fruits, and vitamin A-rich vegetables.

**Figure 29. Frequency of food consumption by food security groups**

![Figure 29. Frequency of food consumption by food security groups](image-url)
The prevalence of food insecurity (severe and moderate) varies from one geographic location to the other and is highest in Alexandria (45.6 per cent) (notably in the districts of Amreya, Gomrok, Borg El-Arab, and poorer parts of Montzah), followed by Damietta (25.7 per cent) (mainly in New Damietta) (Figure 30).

**Figure 30. Household food insecurity by governorate**

While the food insecure households are clustered in specific locations, it should be noted that these locations are not necessarily the poorest districts of Egypt. They can be located in districts known for low prevalence of national poverty like Al-Obour, Nasr City, and Maadi, as well as in less privileged areas like Al Salam and Ein Shams, and this pattern applies to all other governorates. Therefore, an association between the prevalence of national poverty and national food insecurity, and the food security status of refugees can be highly misleading.

**HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH FOOD INSECURITY**

A thorough testing of the association between household socioeconomic characteristics and household access to food was undertaken using logistics regression models. Over 30 socioeconomic indicators were included in different iterations of logistic regressions as explanatory variables for household food insecurity.

The results show that household food insecurity is highly determined by the ability of households to generate income, hence food insecurity increases in households with less than two members able to work, or whose head is either temporarily employed or out of the labour force, or with a single parent, especially females. Food insecurity also increases in households with low resilience to cope with shocks due to their physical disability and indebtedness.
EXPENDITURE, INCOME, AND VULNERABILITY

While the situation in Egypt remains fragile, Syrians continue to be welcomed in Egypt and they are generally appreciated for their entrepreneurial dynamism. The socioeconomic situation in the country, coupled with on-going inflation and steady increases in the prices of basic products and commodities for the last three years, continues to negatively impact the income of Syrian refugees. These circumstances keep reducing the possibilities for self-reliance and employment opportunities.

Figure 31 reflects the inflation rate over the past three years, as published by the Central Bank of Egypt.21

Figure 31. Inflation rate of the Egyptian Pound (January 2012 - May 2017)

EXPENDITURE

Expenditures per capita, as reported in the EVAR, increased by 20 per cent as compared to the SEA to a total of EGP 661 per month. Greater Cairo, comprised of Cairo, Giza, 6th of October City, and Qalyubia show an average increase of 34 per cent, followed by Sharkia with 28 per cent, while the expenditures in the other governorates increased less drastically (Figure 32). These increases are mainly attributed to an increase in prices, especially towards the end of 2016.

Figure 32. Expenditure per capital per month – EVAR compared to SEA

Two Syrian refugees sell cleaning products from their small shop that was established with UNHCR’s support.
© UNHCR/Scott Nelson/September 2016.
UNMET NEEDS

Households were requested to state their most important unmet needs. Support with the rent is the most commonly unmet need, followed by access to additional food, and health-related support. Education or books is the fourth most common response amongst all groups. Support with acquiring assets, clothes, and shoes, as well as livelihood assistance were also recorded as unmet needs.

It should be noted that classification of unmet needs differs among households that receive assistance from those that are ineligible for assistance. Households receiving assistance identified rent or improved shelter (53 per cent) as the most important need as opposed to additional food among those not receiving assistance (56 per cent). The second most commonly unmet need for those receiving assistance is access to additional food (20 per cent) compared to rent or improved shelter for those not receiving assistance (29 per cent). Health support is the third common unmet need for both groups (e.g. households receiving assistance is 10 per cent versus 4 per cent for households not receiving cash assistance). The fourth most common identified need is related to education (households receiving assistance 8 per cent, households not receiving assistance 3.4 per cent).
Figure 34 shows the increased expenditures per capita for both rent and food during the past years. The SEA demonstrates that households reported average rental expenditure per capita at EGP 226, which increased to an average of EGP 243 in 2016, an increase of 7.5 per cent between the averages of both years.

**Figure 34. Monthly household expenditures in the SEA and EVAR**

Food expenditure increased from an average of EGP 248 in 2015 to an average of EGP 335 in 2016, an increase of 35 per cent when comparing 2015 to 2016. As a result of the regular monitoring of the market prices, the food vouchers provided by WFP increased as well during this period (Figure 35).

**Figure 35. Expenditures for food and rent (November 2014 - December 2016)**
Heba's family moved to Egypt in 2012 and settled in 6th of October City, a neighborhood with a high concentration of Syrian refugees.

“My husband used to be a driver back home, but when he was diagnosed with diabetes in Egypt and we were struggling to buy his medication, one of our neighbors advised us to register with UNHCR to benefit from the available health services and so we did,” Heba explained.

Heba works for 2-3 days a week as a domestic helper for 250-300 EGP to make ends meet. “My husband can’t work because of his health situation. Cleaning is very hard physically but I have no other options, I only went to primary school,” she added.

The family benefits from monthly food vouchers amounting to 1,400 EGP in addition to 1,100 EGP cash assistance.

“The rent is very expensive. We pay 1,450 EGP but when we tried moving to a cheaper neighborhood my boys would get harassed every time they would go playing in the streets. I cannot jeopardize their safety to save a few hundred pounds more,” she explains.

Her three older boys aged 11, 8, and 5 years old are enrolled in a public school even though they only go to take their final exam. The children do not feel safe in school, which made Heba move them to a Syrian community school where she feels the learning environment is safer and where she sees her children happier.

The family received the education grant for the past academic year and is expecting this year’s grant in the coming month. “I have been living here for three years and things are getting worse. I can’t see any hope for a better life in Egypt and I can’t see any prospect of going back home,” concluded Heba.

INCOME FROM LABOUR

All Syrian refugee households were asked about their household income from labour during the past 30 days. The reported monthly wage is a weighted average of EGP 1,725 for males and EGP 1,016 for females.

Table 6 shows that income from work is the highest for females and males working in accounting and bookkeeping. This is the only profession where females earn more than men. Syrians employed in the medical, education, and general administration sectors follow in average income. The average income for Syrians working in the business, industry, supply, and manual labour sectors, where almost 85 per cent of the population is working, is between EGP 1,694 and EGP 1,737.

Table 6. Reported income from work per month in Egyptian pounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending School</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Bookkeeping</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Hospital, Dental and Public Health</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>2,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration, Clerical, Office Services</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Industry and Supply</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Labour</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Miscellaneous Occupations</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among all Syrian refugee households, 40 per cent reported that they do not receive any assistance from UNHCR or WFP. Seventy-three per cent of income for these households is reported to come from work, while the remainder is generated from negative coping mechanism.

**INCOME FROM ASSISTANCE**

In 2016, 60 per cent of all UNHCR-registered Syrian households received assistance in the form of multi-purpose cash assistance, food assistance in the form of food vouchers, or both. Out of these, 52 per cent received food vouchers from WFP, 40 per cent received multi-purpose cash assistance from UNHCR, and 28 per cent received both food vouchers and cash assistance from WFP and UNHCR respectively. Less than 1 per cent of Syrian households reported receiving cash assistance from non-governmental organizations. Food vouchers are received roughly equally by female and male-headed households, but female-headed households receive the UNHCR multipurpose cash assistance more frequently than their male headed-household counterparts (24 per cent compared to 18 per cent).

In addition to cash assistance, refugees report income from irregular work to cover their expenditures. Employment income counts for around 41 per cent of total income, with food and cash assistance covering the remaining 59 per cent of the monthly reported expenditure. In addition, refugees report that they resort to negative coping mechanism to make ends meet.

**POST DISTRIBUTION MONITORING OF MULTIPURPOSE CASH ASSISTANCE**

The objective of Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) surveys is to draw out the impact of the multipurpose cash assistance across 3 key areas: process (whether cash has been timely received), outputs (how cash has been used), and outcome (if and how the cash has affected its recipients). Biannual post distribution monitoring surveys were conducted in 2016 by UNHCR for Syrian refugees during the months of May (pre-Ramadan) and November (post-winterization assistance).

The vast majority (87 per cent) of beneficiaries received a text message informing them of the date and amount of cash assistance. Secondary communication channels were used via social networks composed of friends and community members (65 per cent); social media was also used (4 per cent), and only a small minority of refugees (3 per cent) inquired at one of the Egypt Post office branches, where distribution takes place.

Overall, the distribution process performed at the 3,000 Egypt post offices went smoothly and almost all beneficiaries reported their satisfaction with the service provided. Only 2 per cent reported problems at Egypt Post: mainly dissatisfaction related to identification documents or waiting long periods in queues. The survey shows that the process of cash collection at the post office is running smoothly. Sixty per cent of the beneficiaries collected their assistance in less than 30 minutes, reaching 81 per cent for collection in less than 1 hour.

Households report their reliance on cash assistance to meet minimum expenditures on food items and rental costs. The main uses of cash assistance are to cover rent (30 per cent), food (19 per cent), and health (15 per cent) expenditures. Smaller amounts are spent on utilities and education, 10 per cent each, debt repayment (4 per cent), and hygiene items (3 per cent).
INCOME FROM REMITTANCES

Only 6.7 per cent (1,563) of households report that they receive regular remittances or income from salaries or pensions. Almost half, 49 per cent, receive remittances from family or friends living inside Egypt with an average of EGP 898 per month (Table 7). This is followed by remittances received from family and friends living abroad with a higher average of EGP 2,092 per month. Most of the families receiving money from family and friends are in the mild and low vulnerability groups. Very few are receiving a pension or a salary from abroad as a source of income.

Table 7. Income from remittances and other sources outside work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Support Source</th>
<th>HH</th>
<th>% of HH</th>
<th>Average Amount in EGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money received from family or friends living in Egypt</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money received from family or friends living abroad</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BORROWING, SAVINGS AND SALE OF ASSETS

The percentage of Syrian households resorting to other means as a source of income has slightly decreased from 2014/2015 with 9 per cent in 2016. While the SEA recorded 68 per cent of households resorting to negative coping mechanism, in 2016, this percentage was down to 59 per cent.

Eighty six per cent of households report that they borrow money compared to 84 per cent recorded in the SEA. Spending savings is the second most used negative coping mechanism yet a significant decrease is noticed between 2014/2015 and 2016, with a drop of 21 per cent among households using negative coping mechanism compared to 11 per cent in 2016. A similar decrease is also recorded in selling assets, which dropped from 13 per cent to 4 per cent. The decline in both spending savings and selling assets demonstrates that the households’ resources have been depleted over time. While child labour was 2.7 per cent in the SEA, it was not reported as a negative coping mechanism. In the EVAR, 6.2 per cent of the households reported child labour as a negative coping mechanism (Figure 36). The total percentage of reported child labour is 7 per cent out of children assessed.

Figure 36. Coping mechanisms
Borrowed money is used mainly to address domestic expenses (47 per cent), rent (25 per cent), and health care costs (22 per cent) (Figure 37).

**Figure 37. Reasons for borrowing money**

ASSET DEPLETION COPING STRATEGIES

Asset depletion coping strategies undermine a household’s ability to access food because they erode their already depleted resource base, further pushing them into poverty and affecting their future food security. The strategies most applied were reducing expenditure on food (79 per cent), buying food on credit or borrowing money to buy food (37 per cent), reducing essential non-food expenditures such as health or education (72 per cent), spending savings (6 per cent), selling household goods (3 per cent).

DEBT

The percentage of households reporting being in debt is 73 per cent. This is a slight increase from the 72 per cent reported the year before (Table 8). No strong correlation can be made between the year of arrival in Egypt and the amount of reported debt.

**Table 8. Year of arrival in Egypt and reported debt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Reported total debt in EGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2012</td>
<td>12,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of households (91 per cent) borrowed money informally either from friends, family, acquaintances, or Egyptians. The second source of debt, amounting to 9 per cent of those carrying debt, is also informally loaned, in the form of supermarkets and shops, with very few households (0.4 per cent) borrowing from so-called “loan sharks” (Table 9).
Table 9. Source of debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Source</th>
<th>Percentage of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal – community (friend, family, acquaintances, host community)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal – supermarket/shops/loan sharks</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal – bank/ financial institution</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syrian refugees were also asked about the debt repayment method and 81 per cent reported that they are not able to repay their debts. The remaining households use their income or cash assistance to repay debt. However, 1 per cent reported selling their food vouchers to meet debt obligations.

VULNERABILITY

All households were categorized into the four different welfare groups (e.g. the vulnerability thresholds), based on the poverty model and the MEB. The majority of Syrian households (51 per cent) are in the severe vulnerability group, meaning that their predicted expenditure per capita is less than half the calculated MEB. Almost 30 per cent of the households fall in the high vulnerability group, with a predicted expenditure still below the MEB. Only 18 per cent of the households are in the mild and low vulnerability groups (Table 11). This data should be reviewed with the understanding that a MEB of EGP 592 was used for this report and therefore, given the inflation at the end of 2016, more households would fall into the high and severe vulnerability groups if this rise in inflation was taken into account.

Table 10. Debt repayment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Repayment</th>
<th>Percentage of HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Repayment</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash assistance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell household goods</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell food vouchers</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VULNERABILITY BY REGION

Alexandria and Matrouh host 19 per cent of the Syrian refugee population in Egypt, and they are the governorates with the most vulnerable populations with 73 per cent and 78 per cent of individuals respectively falling in the severe vulnerability categories. Qalyubia is the governorate with the least vulnerable households with 46 per cent identified as severely vulnerable households (Map 3).
GENDER DYNAMICS

Women’s lack of participation in the labour market increases the vulnerability of households. In households with only females of working age (18-60), almost two thirds (57 per cent) fall into the severe category, almost twice that of households with male workers (23 per cent). Despite the fact that educational qualifications are more or less equal, cultural norms and family obligations create a significant disparity, which may also signify an opportunity to escape protracted poverty.

Table 12. Income for female headed and male headed households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of income gap</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Female-headed households</th>
<th>Male-headed Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Households able to cover &gt;150% of their expenses</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Households able to cover between 100% and 150% of their expenses</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Households able to cover between 50% and 100% of their expenditure</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Households able to cover less than 50% of their expenditure</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND DEPENDENCY RATIO

The size of the household is a major determining factor for its level of vulnerability. Households with larger family sizes tend to be more vulnerable with an average of 4.9 people per household for the severely vulnerable households and 4.5 people per household for the highly vulnerable households. Households in the mild vulnerability have an average of 3.2 people and there are 1.8 people in the low vulnerability category (Figure 38).

In addition to size, the number of dependants in a household has a major impact on the vulnerability levels of a household. For this review, the number of household members of working age reported to have a vulnerability and the number of dependants below 18 years and above 60 years were analyzed. The analysis showed that in the low household vulnerability group, only 12 per cent of households have dependants while in the high vulnerability group, 57 per cent have dependants.

Figure 38. Household vulnerability per household size

![Figure 38. Household vulnerability per household size](image-url)
Helal prepares his polishing products to treat furniture. © UNHCR/Hossam Horus/January 2017.
LIVELIHOODS

Egypt has faced serious economic challenges over the past two years, including a significant decrease in the gross domestic product. The country is faced with an unemployment rate of 13.2 per cent and a high youth unemployment rate. An increasing number of Egyptians are working in the informal sector and in temporary employment. While refugees are entitled to the same treatment as other foreigners, and would fit into the 10 per cent quota for foreign labour, acquiring work permits requires lengthy bureaucratic procedures that are very difficult to achieve. As a result, the majority of Syrian refugees working in Egypt must navigate a precarious and sometimes dangerous informal sector.

WORKING INDIVIDUALS

Of the entire working age refugee population (which is around 51 per cent of the surveyed population), only 38 per cent reported being economically active, of whom 92 per cent were males and the remaining were females signifying large gender imbalances. There are also large disparities between genders on their employment status. Of the 78 per cent working males identified by EVAR, the majority have regular work, whereas of the 12 per cent of females working, the majority are self-employed, as reflected in Figure 39.

Figure 39. Employment status of working age individuals (18 – 60 years)

[Diagram showing employment status]

Working individuals have different channels to find jobs with 53 per cent reporting to have found work independently, while 40 per cent found employment through family and friends, 6 per cent through their community, and 0.5 per cent through NGOs.

NON-WORKING INDIVIDUALS

The reasons provided by non-working males in the working age population are diverse, and include the lack of opportunities, the pursuit of school, being too old, and temporary physical inability (Figure 40).

---

Figure 40. Reasons of non-working Syrian males

Reasons for unemployment are correlated with age group in some cases. For 18 to 19 year olds, 52 per cent of respondents listed studying as the reason for their unemployment, and this becomes less significant with age. Studying was listed by 47 per cent of those between 20 and 24, and by 17 per cent of those in the 25 to 29 age category. By contrast, those reporting being too old to work increases with age, increasing from 23 per cent of those in the 50 to 54 age category to 52 per cent in the 55 to 60 age category.

EMPLOYMENT BY GOVERNORATE

Of the ten governorates with the largest Syrian refugee populations, the highest number of male workers can be found in Sharkia, where the 10th of Ramadan City and its industrial areas are located, and in Qalyoubia where Obour city is located, and in Cairo where 6th of October City is located. The highest number of non-working males are located in Alexandria and Matrouh (approximately 65 per cent each), where employment opportunities are significantly lower as reflected in Figure 41. In Damietta, where there are opportunities for traditional skilled artisans, the male employment rate is 71 per cent.
EMPLOYMENT BY AGE GROUP

Figure 42 demonstrates that the number of working refugees tends to increase for both males and females with age, peaking at the 30 to 34 age group with 85.74 per cent of males working and 7.4 per cent of females working. The 18 to 19 and 50 to 60 age groups have the smallest percentage of people working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>18 - 19</th>
<th>20 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 29</th>
<th>30 - 34</th>
<th>35 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 44</th>
<th>45 - 49</th>
<th>50 - 54</th>
<th>55 - 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 19</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKING BELOW OR OVER THE WORKING AGE

Four per cent of working Syrian refugees are either below 18 years or above 60 years and engaged in some form of employment with 3.5 per cent reported to be children under the age of 18 and 0.5 per cent above the age of 60.

OCCUPATION

The majority of working male Syrian refugees (71 per cent) work in the service and skilled trades sectors as manual labour, which include such jobs as: restaurant waiters, drivers, sales, tailoring, and carpentry. Fourteen per cent of working males work in the business and production/industrial sectors (Figure 43). The remaining work as administrators and in other more highly skilled jobs.

Figure 43. Occupation of Syrian males

Half of working females (50 per cent) work in the service and skilled trades sectors such as tailoring, cookery, hairdressing and home-based work. Fifteen per cent of working females are employed in the educational sector; mainly in Syrian community-based schools (Figure 44).

Figure 44. Occupation of Syrian females

EMPLOYMENT AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Syrian refugees who completed higher education find employment in the education, health, accounting, and clerical sectors (Figure 45). However, very few (4 per cent) Syrians are employed in these sectors. The correlation of educational attainment with employment indicates that it is challenging for Syrians with higher education to find suitable occupations in Egypt.
LEVEL OF WORK SATISFACTION

The majority of Syrian refugees (68 per cent) report not being very satisfied with their current occupation. Only 24 per cent report being mostly satisfied. These responses are consistent for male and female populations. The assessment identifies accounting and bookkeeping as the category with the highest work satisfaction (38.5 per cent) (Figure 46).

Figure 46. Level of work satisfaction
Levels of dissatisfaction are equal among men and women, and are predominantly related to three main categories: inadequate earnings (40 per cent), long working hours (28 per cent), and non-productive/non-fulfilling employment (13 per cent) (Table 14).

**Table 13. Reasons for job dissatisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate earnings</td>
<td>41.45%</td>
<td>39.69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>28.74%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-productive/non-fulfilling job</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>12.91%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak job security/stability of employment</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification mismatch (over/under-qualified for the job)</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to balance work, family and personal life</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe work environment</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment by employers</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HELAL ALI FATTA**

Helal is a 40 year-old Syrian married man with two children who are enrolled in school. He came to Egypt three years ago and started working as vegetables’ seller for 8 months.

Initially Helal received some financial assistance from UNHCR. He, however, started to work in polishing furniture at a shop for EGP 90 per day where he was able to establish strong relationships with customers and his work expanded significantly, so he needed to rent tools to finish the additional work.

Later, he applied for a livelihoods grant to buy necessary tools, which he received in July 2016 for an amount of EGP 2,500. He bought the materials he needed and now he can finish more orders than before working at someone’s shop. Helal makes an average of EGP 1,500-2,000 per month.

Helal applied for an additional grant to scale up his business in 2017, and received a grant in August of EGP 6,000 to buy a new compressor, and other necessary tools. He also opened his own shop in Al Nakheel Beach, Agamy.

His parents are also living with him now, and he is able to provide for his family and take care of them.
## Module 1: Household Bio Data

This module should be duplicated and completed for each member of the household.

### 1.1 Given Name

### 1.2 Family Name

### 1.3 Are you registered with UNHCR? (if ‘no’ proceed to question 1.6)

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

### 1.4 Case Number

### 1.5 Individual Number

### 1.6 Passport number / ID number

### 1.7 Valid Passport

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### 1.8 Nationality

### 1.9 Valid residency

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### 1.10 Physically present during the interview

- [ ] Present
- [ ] Absent

### 1.11 If valid residency, type of permit

- Passport – Educational residency
- Passport – Egyptian family member
- Passport – Tourism
- Passport – Investor
- Yellow Card

### 1.12 Phone Number

### 1.13 Date of Birth

### 1.14 Sex

- [ ] Female
- [ ] Unspecified
- Head of Household
- Son
- Husband
- Daughter
### 1.15 Relation to head of household
- Brother
- Grandmother
- Aunt
- Father-in-law
- Brother-in-law
- Nephew
- Granddaughter
- No blood relation
- Other blood relation
- Mother
- Grandfather
- Son-in-law
- Sister-in-law
- Cousin (female)
- Cousin (male)
- Father
- Uncle
- Mother-in-law
- Daughter-in-law
- Niece
- Half-brother
- Half-sister

### 1.16 Marital Status
- Married
- Single
- Widowed
- Separated
- Divorced
- Engaged

### 1.17 Specific Needs Category
- Disability - Visual
- Partial Disability - Visual
- Disability - Hearing
- Partial Disability - Hearing
- Disability - Physical
- Partial Disability - Physical
- Disability - Mental
- Partial Disability - Mental
- Pregnant or lactating woman
- Single parent
- Unaccompanied child
- Child-headed household
- Child at risk
- Child under long-term treatment
- Child with special educational needs
- Older person at risk
- Underage marriage
- Hospitalization following an emergency in the past 3 months
- Woman at risk
- Psychiatric illness not adjusted with treatment
- Speech impairment

### 1.18 Level of Education
- None / KG
- Primary
- Preparatory
- Secondary
- Higher Education
- Other
- Technical

### 1.19 Do you contribute to HH income?
- Yes
- No

### 1.20 Employment Status
- Self-employed
- Unemployed (looking for work)
- Out of labor force
- Regularly Employed
- Temporarily Employed
- Self Employed - Temporarily

### 1.21 If self-employed, how much capital was required for business start-up?
- EGP

### 1.22 If self-employed, how many employees do you have?
- Egyptian employees
- Syrian employees
- Employees of other nationalities

### 1.23 If self-employed, how many employees do you have?
- Formal loan – bank/ financial institution
- Informal loan – community (friend, family, acquaintances, host community)
- Informal borrowing - community (friend, family, acquaintances, host community)
- Informal borrowing – loan shark
- Shared/partnerships
- Savings
- Sold domestic items/assets
- Assistance (e.g. livelihood programme)
- Remittances
- Begged
- Contributions
- Partnership through effort

### 1.24 If not employed, why? Please give the reasons
- Not seeking work
- Lack of skills
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Safety concerns
- Temporary physical inability (if selected go to 1.25)
- Permanent physical inability (if selected go to 1.25)
- Family responsibilities
- Culture and tradition
- Delayed wages
- Non-payment of wages
- Low wages
- Long distance/long commute
- High transportation costs
- Too young to work
- Too old to work
- Studying
- Lack of information
- Legal / Non recognition of educational certificate
- Other (please specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.25    | Kindly clarify how the physical inability to work affects you. | - Totally unable to work  
- Able to work but for desk/simple jobs (unable to join a job requiring heavy labor like carrying goods) |
| 1.26    | If you are employed, are you satisfied with your current employment? | - Very satisfied  
- Mostly satisfied  
- Not very satisfied  
- Not at all satisfied |
| 1.27    | What support (if any) does your business or to find adequate employment? | - Training  
- Mentorship  
- Linkage to job opportunities  
- Access to banking services  
- Loan/grant to start business  
- Legal assistance (work permit, licensing, registration) |
| 1.28    | If you are not satisfied with your employment, why? Please give the reasons. | - Qualification mismatch (over/under qualified for the job)  
- Inadequate earnings  
- Non-productive/non-fulfilling job  
- Working hours  
- Inability to balance work, family and personal life  
- Weak job security/stability of employment  
- Treatment by employers  
- Unsafe work environment  
- Other |
| 1.29    | How did you find your job/start your occupation? | - Contacts through family and friends  
- Community based organizations or NGO/UNHCR  
- Internet or newspaper  
- Independently  
- Contacts through my community  
- Other |
| 1.30    | Occupation in Egypt (multiple choices possible) | - ProGres List  
- Doctor  
- Nursing  
- Pharmacist  
- Chemistry  
- Geologist  
- Farmer  
- Engineer  
- Assistant Engineer  
- Construction worker  
- Electrician  
- Alumital work  
- Air-conditioning maintenance  
- Plumber  
- Welder  
- Mechanic  
- Carpenter  
- Upholsterer  
- Food production  
- Lawyer  
- Accountant  
- Teacher  
- Secretany/admin work  
- Translator  
- Butcher  
- Chef  
- Baker  
- Pastry-maker  
- In a restaurant  
- Sides  
- Cashier  
- Ironing  
- Tailoring  
- Hairdresser/barber  
- Delivery person  
- Driver  
- Marble Worker  
- Grocer  
- Woodworker |
| 1.31    | Occupation in Syria (multiple choices possible) | - ProGres List +  
- Doctor  
- Nursing  
- Pharmacist  
- Chemistry  
- Geologist  
- Farmer  
- Engineer  
- Assistant Engineer  
- Construction worker  
- Electrician  
- Alumital work  
- Lawyer  
- Accountant  
- Teacher  
- Secretany/admin work  
- Translator  
- Butcher  
- Chef  
- Baker  
- Pastry-maker  
- In a restaurant  
- Sides  
- Cashier |
| 1.40    | Where does your child work? | - In a factory  
- In the street  
- At home  
- In a restaurant  
- In a bar/café  
- In a shop  
- Beauty center/Barber shop/Hairdresser  
- In tanneries  
- In the fields  
- In a harbor/on a boat  
- In an office  
- Other please specify: |
| 1.41    | Does your child’s work involve any of the following (tick all that apply)? | - Carrying heavy loads  
- Working with chemicals/explosives  
- Working with dangerous tools/operating heavy equipment  
- Working at heights  
- Collecting or sorting garbage  
- Exposure to dust, fumes or gas  
- Exposure to extreme heat or humidity  
- Exposure to loud noise or vibrations  
- Exposure to harassment  
- Exposure to sexual and/or gender based violence  
- None of the above |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.42 | Does your child go to school?  
- Yes  
- No |
| 1.43 | What type of school?  
- Community school  
- Public school  
- Public school for special needs  
- Private school  
- Private school for special needs |
| 1.44 | If your child (below 15) is not enrolled at school, please give the reason(s)  
- Children working in order to support the family  
- Disability or serious medical issue  
- Lack of documentation  
- Not aware of procedures to register  
- Discrimination or harassment  
- Gender-specific harassment  
- Harassment from teachers  
- Language barrier  
- No school nearby  
- School curricula are different from Syria  
- Cost of transport too high  
- Unsafe neighborhood  
- Marriage  
- Below school age  
- Late time of second school shift  
- Bullying  
- Cost of education too high  
- Poor quality of education  
- Lack of schools for female-only students  
- No available slots/Capacity at school  
- Ongoing registration |

**Module 2: Living conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - independent house (not part of a building)  
- Apartment  
- Separate room in a shared apartment  
- Workplace  
- Collective shelter  
- Factory/warehouse/worksite  
- Unfinished shelter/tent  
- Garage  
- Homeless  
- Housing in multiple occupation |
| Type of occupancy  |  
| **2.2**          |  
| - Owned apartment/house  
- Furnished rental  
- Unfurnished rental  
- Provided by Employer  
- Assistance  
- Hosted (for free)  
- Squatting |
| If renting, type of tenancy agreement  |  
| **2.3**          |  
| - Notarized contract  
- Unregistered contract  
- Informal agreement |
| If renting, how much is the total rent per month  |  
| **2.4**          |  
| EGP |
| Living space in m² (Occupied by your HH)  |  
| **2.6**          |  
| m² |
| Bathrooms Able to use by your HH  |  
| **2.8**          |  
| - Exclusive to the HH  
- Shared  
- None |
| How many people are sharing the bathroom/toilet?  |  
| **2.9**          |  
|  
| Does your household own the following items? (in usable condition and sufficient for HH’s needs)  |  
| **2.10**         |  
| - Mattresses  
- Refrigerator  
- Table/Chairs  
- Washing machine  
- Soap  
- Washing powder  
- Beds  
- Stove  
- Sofa set  
- TV  
- Toothbrush & toothpaste  
- Sanitary towels  
- Winter clothes  
- Kitchen utensils  
- Heating for house  
- Computer  
- Appropriate size diapers  
- HH waste bin/container  
- Blankets  
- Water heater  
- Air conditioning  
- Car  
- Motorcycle  
- Shaving cream & razors  
- Washing liquid & basin  
- Smartphone |
### Module 3: Income and expenditure

#### 3.1 What is the minimum amount of money that your household needs for bare survival?  EGP

#### 3.2 What is the estimated amount spent on average per month over the past 3 months by the household for each of the following items? Write 0 if there is no expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>EGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health - related expenditures</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt repayment</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for family or friends</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (including WFP voucher)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-related expenditures</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-related expenditures</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene and cleaning materials</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for family or friends</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 Presence of bills/contract for verification?

- Rental contract
- Gas bills
- Water bills

#### 3.4 Have you incurred any unexpected expenses in the past month? (if ‘No, proceed to 3.7)

- Yes
- No

#### 3.5 If yes, what were they for?

Choose from expenditure items listed in 3.2

#### 3.6 If yes, what was the amount of the unexpected expenses?

EGP

#### 3.7 Please specify the amount of cash/income you received during the last month from each of the following sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Income from assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WFP</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNHCR (cash)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNHCR (education)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNICEF (cash)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UNICEF (education)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CRS</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caritas (cash)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caritas (medical)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mahmoud hospital</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AMU</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NGO</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income from work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regular employment</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporary employment</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-employment</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seasonal employment</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income from negative coping mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selling assets</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selling food assistance</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Borrowing</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Begging</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child labor</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spent savings</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Income from external sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pension</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Salary</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Money sent by family or friends from abroad</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Money sent by family and friends in country</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One time</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recurring/regular</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 If you have debts, what is the source?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- formal – bank/financial institution</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- informal – community (friend, family, acquaintances, host community)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- informal – supermarket/shops</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- informal – loan shark</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Why did you borrow money?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cover domestic expenses (cooking fuel, gas, electricity, food, drinking water)</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rent</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education/books</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medicine/health</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legal assistance/documentation</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travel</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marriage</td>
<td>EGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Total amount of outstanding debt</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 How do you repay your debts (time and modality)?
- Income
- Cash assistance
- Sell WFP vouchers
- Sell household goods
- No repayment
- Other

3.12 For remittances sent from abroad, transfer type:
- Bank transfer
- Money transfer companies (Western Union, Moneygram etc.)
- In person
- Post Office

3.13 If remittances are regular, how often do you receive them?
- Monthly
- Bimonthly
- Every six months

3.14 What amount do you have in savings? EGP

Module 4: Food consumption

4.1 Yesterday, how many meals did your household eat? (meals comparable to breakfast, lunch, dinner)
Consider only meals prepared and consumed at home or in public kitchen but not in private restaurants or street food. DO NOT count food consumed in very small amounts, i.e. less than a teaspoon per person or consumed by only one member of HH.

4.2 CONSUMPTION PATTERN
Over the last 7 days, how many days did you consume the following foods? (0 = Not eaten, 1 = 1 day, 2 = 2 days, 3 = 3 days, 4 = 4 days, 5 = 5 days, 6 = 6 days, 7 = Everyday)

4.3 FOOD SOURCES
What was the main source of the food in the past 7 days? (0= Not consumed, 1 = Own production, 2 = Bought with cash, 3 = Bought on credit, 4 = Exchanged/ borrowed, 5 = Received as gift, 6 = WFP food assistance, 7 = Non WFP official food assistance, 8 = gathering/ fishing), 9 = PDS, 10 = Family reserve

Child Food consumption

4.4 Did the child eat or drink any of the following food items yesterday? 0= No, 1= Yes

Food Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Groups</th>
<th>Child no. 1</th>
<th>Child no. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Group 1 - Grains, Roots, tubers (Bread, rice, noodles or other food made from grains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Group 2 - Legumes and nuts (Any food made from beans, peas, lentils, nuts or seeds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Group 3- Dairy products (Fresh milk, tinned milk, milk powder, formula milk, yoghurt, cheese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Group 4- Meat and Fish Meat (lamb, goat, beef, inner organs), Poultry (chicken, duck) Fish (fresh or dried fish, shell fish or sea food)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Group 5 - Eggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Group 6 - Vitamin A Rich Vegetables and Fruits</strong> (Dark yellow or orange fleshed, tubers, roots, or vegetables: pumpkin, carrots sweet, red pepper, squash or sweet potatoes that are yellow inside)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Group 7 - Other Vegetables and Fruits</strong> (Tomato, onion, cucumber, banana, apple, orange)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td><strong>Yesterday, did the child receive breast milk?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td><strong>Yesterday, how many times did the child drink milk, other than breast milk?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td><strong>Yesterday, how many times did the child eat solid, semi-solid foods or other liquids?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td><strong>Yesterday, did the child receive iron fortified infant formula (like Cerelac and Babylic)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module 5: Household coping mechanisms**

| 5.1 | During the last 7 days, how many days did your household had to employ one of the following strategies to cope with a lack of food or money to buy it? 0 = Not applied, 1 = 1 day, 2 = 2 days, 3 = 3 days, 4 = 4 days, 5 = 5 days, 6 = 6 days, 7 = Everyday |
| 5.1.1 | Relent on less preferred and less expensive food (i.e. cheaper lower quality food) |
| 5.1.2 | Borrow food or relied on help from relative(s), friend(s) or faith-based organizations |
| 5.1.3 | Reduce number of meals eaten in a day |
| 5.1.4 | Limit portion size at mealtime (different from above: i.e. less food per meal) |
| 5.1.5 | Restrict consumption by adults in order for younger children to eat |
| 5.2 | In the past 30 days, has your household applied any of the below strategies to meet basic needs? 1 = Yes, 2 = No, because I have exhausted this strategy already and cannot do it anymore, 3 = No, I don't have any/it is not available to me, 4 = No, but I have access to it/it is available to me, 5= No, it is available to me but I will never use it |
| 5.2.1 | Spent savings |
| 5.2.2 | Bought food on credit or borrowed money to purchase food |
| 5.2.3 | Reduced essential non-food expenditures such as education/health |
| 5.2.4 | Borrowed money to cover basic needs (health, rent, etc.) |
| 5.2.5 | Sold household goods (jewelry, phone, furniture, electro domestics, bicycle etc.) |
| 5.2.6 | Sold productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheel borrow, bicycle, car, motorbike) |
| 5.2.7 | Adult (Male) accepted high risk, illegal, exploitative temporary jobs (describe in comments if revealed) |
| 5.2.8 | Adult (Female) accepted high risk, illegal, exploitative temporary jobs (describe in comments if revealed) |
| 5.2.9 | Child accepted high risk, illegal, exploitative temporary jobs (describe in comments if revealed) |
| 5.2.10 | Sent adult household members to beg |
| 5.2.11 | Sent children household members to beg (under 18) |
| 5.2.12 | Sent children to work |
| 5.2.13 | Changed accommodation location or type in order to reduce expenditures |
| 5.3 | In the past year, has your household applied any of the below strategies to meet basic needs? 1 = Yes, 2 = No, because I have exhausted this strategy already and cannot do it anymore, 3 = No, I don't have any/it is not available to me, 4 = No, but I have access to it/it is available to me, 5= No, it is available to me but I will never use it |
| 5.3.1 | Female member(s) of the household (over 18) got married to ensure their financial security |
| 5.3.2 | Female member(s) of the household (under 18) is getting married to ensure her financial security |
| 5.3.3 | Female member(s) of the household (under 18) got married to ensure their financial security |
| 5.3.4 | Female member(s) of the household (over 18) is getting married to ensure her financial security |
| 5.3.5 | One or more members of your household migrated regularly outside Egypt |
|   | Date: Nr. or members: |
| 5.3.6 | One or more members of your household is planning to migrate regularly outside Egypt |
|   | Date: Nr. or members: |
| 5.3.7 | One or more members of your household migrated irregularly outside Egypt |
| 5.3.8 | One or more members of your household is planning to migrate irregularly outside Egypt |
| 5.3.9 | One or more members of your household attempted to migrate regularly outside Egypt |
| 5.3.10 | One or more members of your household attempted to migrate irregularly outside Egypt |
### Module 6: Observations and referrals

#### 6.1 What are the Household’s 3 main unmet needs at this moment; in order of importance? (Use the codes below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>2nd in importance</th>
<th>3rd in importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) No unmet need</td>
<td>9) Psycho-social support</td>
<td>17) Children activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) More food</td>
<td>10) Clothes/shoes</td>
<td>18) Physical security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Better quality food</td>
<td>11) Kitchen assets for cooking</td>
<td>19) Legal assistance/documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Support for rent/improved shelter</td>
<td>12) Other household assets</td>
<td>20) Sanitation/sewage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Cooking fuel, gas, electricity</td>
<td>13) Agricultural inputs</td>
<td>21) Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Medicines/health</td>
<td>14) Transport</td>
<td>22) Baby food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Education/books</td>
<td>15) Credit</td>
<td>23) Youth activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Livelihoods support</td>
<td>16) Child care</td>
<td>24) Fans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2 In your opinion, which of the four vulnerability thresholds does this household fall within?
- [ ] Severe vulnerability
- [x] High vulnerability
- [ ] Mild vulnerability
- [ ] Low Vulnerability

#### 6.3 Recommended Referrals:

- Health issues
- Registration-related
- Livelihood
- Financial assistance
- Education
- Psychosocial support
- Protection
- Child protection
- Credibility Concern / Please check observations

#### 5.1.5 Referral prioritization:
- Emergency
- Urgent
- Normal
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3RP</td>
<td>Syrian Refugee and Resilience Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAR</td>
<td>Egypt Vulnerability assessment for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoE</td>
<td>Government of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAUS</td>
<td>Health Access and Utilization Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEB</td>
<td>Minimum Expenditure Basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoHP</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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