



Shared Prosperity Dignified Life



Virtual Consultation Meeting on “Understanding Livelihood Solutions Under Protracted Forced Displacement: The Case of Homs’ Refugees Population in Lebanon”

(2 November 2020)

Meeting Report

The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) organized a virtual consultation meeting to discuss the study on “Understanding Livelihood Solutions Under Protracted Forced Displacement: The Case of Homs’ Refugees Population in Lebanon” on 2 November 2020.

The aim of the consultation meeting was to highlight the main findings of the study based on the conducted secondary and primary reviews (key informant interview (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), surveys) during April – June 2020.

The participants represented key actors engaged in agriculture livelihood programming including the Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), UN organizations (FAO, WFP, UNHCR, UNDP, and ILO), National NGOs, International NGOs, and individual experts.

The meeting was attended by 34 participants.

I. Introduction: ESCWA initiative for livelihood programming under forced protracted displacement

Ms. Reem Nejdawi, Chief of Food and Environment Policy Section (FEPS) at ESCWA, welcomed participants and facilitated the opening session. Ms. Nejdawi introduced the study and presented the meeting agenda which was composed of four sessions: 1) introduction 2) presentation of the data collection methodology and the findings of the study followed by Q&A 3) validation of findings 4) discussion. She emphasized on the importance of Lebanon case study to understand forced displacement and how the livelihood basis are impacted. Following the introduction, **Mr. Elias Ghadban**, Regional Advisor on Food Security at ESCWA, presented Homs’ initiative and emphasized on the four main pillars taken into consideration while designing the study including 1) the protracted nature of forced displacement in the Arab region; there are 7 Arab states classified as either fragile or under conflict 2) importance of understanding the challenges of the Syrian conflict from regional and multi-dimensional perspectives 3) the

Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) in which member states agreed to better prepare and find solution for refugees with a mandate lead by UNHCR 4) production of context-based analytical solutions to lead the policy change influencing the socio-economic conditions for the most vulnerable. From these four pillars and taking into consideration the Syria program at ESCWA, the study aimed to understand how livelihood programming in a protracted forced displacement are responding to specific economic sectors while equipping refugees and host communities with better skills and knowledge. Mr. Ghadban highlighted the hypothesis of the study which is that refugees will utilize those skills while in the host country for temporary economic inclusion and benefit from them when they decide to voluntarily return to their country of origin. Homs was taken as a case study because a significant portion of Syrian refugees in Lebanon (24%) and in Jordan (16%) originates from Homs. Three studies were conducted under this initiative. One in Homs which included an agriculture restoration plan to understand the value chains and the necessary measures to restore agriculture livelihoods at the governorate level; and two studies were carried out in parallel, one in Jordan and the other in Lebanon which was discussed in this meeting. The initiative is designed to better understand the macro regional approach for forced displacement solutions that could be considered as a pilot to be utilized in other countries under conflict in the Arab region.

II. Session 1: Lebanon case study: Presentation of findings

Ms. Nour Azzi presented the data collection methodology consisting of primary and secondary reviews conducted during April – June 2020. She then presented the findings of the surveys done with Homs refugees. **Dr. Jad Abou Arrage**, ESCWA consultant, continued to present the results of the KIIs with main stakeholders, FGDs with Lebanese farmers and Homs refugees and finally he concluded with policy recommendations which were later discussed and validated in session 2 by main actors programming agriculture livelihood in Lebanon. The first session was followed by Q&A which was moderated by Ms. Nejdawi. Participants raised the following questions/concerns:

Q&A:

- Q1: What was the quota of the budget divided (how much assigned for refugees and how much for host communities)?
A1: It's 50/50 in terms of benefitting from FFT activities and their participation. However, the budget, as shown in the three year 2017-2019 in the different LCRP reports, doesn't show the allocation for each activity and is not linked to the results stated.
- Q2: What about the relationship among the supported people (refugees and host communities)?
A2: No specific relationship, however, due to the protracted nature of the case study social relationships do exist between Syrian and Lebanese benefiting from livelihoods activities.
- Q3: What about the sustainability of the project beyond the project?
A3: The study showed that there is a weakness in the sustainability of projects and many of them weren't designed to be sustainable. The study examined the projects based on

sustainability components including the sustainable livelihoods framework as well as the value chain approach and proposed tailored policy recommendations.

- Q4: Why are participants saying that the organic agriculture is not possible?
A4: Farmers did not say that it is not possible. They indicated that it is difficult to implement especially for small farmers located in areas where agricultural land are mixed together. They don't own the resources to invest in organic farming (small agricultural plots, high cost of certification, etc.). Moreover, some farmers believe in the downstream of the value chains, their products even if organically certified they might be mixed with non-organic products and not receive their deserved value.
- Q5: FFA and FFT are modalities specific to WFP. To avoid confusion, to stick to project description as: asset creation and trainings.
A5: Yes it is right. The author will reformulate it to avoid confusion. However, when actors go to the field, people are used to FFT/FFA without indication to any specific organization.
- Q6: Would you please give us information about the ownership modality of the goods or the services delivered by a single project? Especially when you are talking about the women cooperatives? Are these cooperative mixed by IDPs & host communities? Is there any conflict noticed between the beneficiaries after the project end and the assets delivered to the cooperative? And at which level the ownership modality of the projects is usually designed? Is it in the exit strategy level?

A6: Based on the observations on the field and data collected, the ownership is full to the cooperatives who are mainly owned and managed by Lebanese farmers. Refugees are integrated in the participation in the production systems but not in the ownership unless there is asset distribution directly to refugees e.g. very small tools and equipment distributed for personal gardening but not for large scale production. The enabling environment does not allow the provision of assets to refugees.

- Q7: On the policy recommendation: how do ongoing governmental institutional and policy challenges affect the success or failure of your recommendations?
A7: This is related to the institutional challenges in Lebanon and of course it has an impact on the long term sustainability of the projects. There is also a role played by local NGOs to compensate this challenge and somehow contribute to ensuring the sustainability of interventions.
- Q8: Why consolidating the data about refugee expertise and specialties are not considered as recommendation, this is because those might have the chance for engaging in big projects in near future maybe in Africa or Middle East. This should be a recommendation because data at NGOs is scattered, need to be unified. Example on that is the big project in Saudi Arabia Red Sea (Obhur Seaside), once launched, they will need thousands of skilled construction and agriculture labors etc.
A8: This can fall under the two recommendations of improving partnership between different organizations and establishing a solid partnership between grass-rooted and international organizations. It is a cross-cutting issue that can be done through different mechanisms.
- Q9: Did you take into consideration the racism that is facing the Syrian refugees? Does the 50/50 formula whereas the Lebanese farmer is gaining from the refugees and hence should not see them as competition helps in reducing racism?

A9: It was always a good relationship between Lebanese farmers and Syrian refugees (historic corporation between Lebanon and Syria). Protection policies in livelihood programming to avoid racism is something that need to be improved in the policy recommendations of this study.

III. Session 2: Validation of findings and key actors' recommendations for tailored agriculture livelihood programming under forced displacement

A. Mr. Maurice Saade – Country Director – Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) – Lebanon

Mr. Maurice Saade, congratulated the authors on the useful and comprehensive study of agriculture livelihood programming in Lebanon. He also hoped that the lessons learned will be integrated by partners in their future programming.

Take over messages:

- The most interesting part of the study was the feedback received from the beneficiaries, especially from Syrian refugees since their voices are rarely heard. This has been a longstanding criticism by several external evaluations of the LCRP and other projects. Mr. Saade appreciated the recommendation about the participation of refugees in project design, and also think about their representation at a higher level like in the LCRP planning and coordination mechanism. All partners are represented including governmental agencies, NGOs, INGOs and UN agencies but the main beneficiaries which are the Syrian refugees are not.
- It would have been interesting to have larger groups of FGDs and include more refugees not only from Homs to get their full feedback on the impact of agriculture livelihoods activities conducted in Lebanon. He also added that the participation of Lebanese host communities was interesting yet not very representative because the groups are small and especially in vulnerable areas such as in Akkar and Baalbeck-Hermel and recommended the expansion of the sample size in similar studies.
- The participation of different stakeholders in the KIIs was quite comprehensive, yet it did not include the donors which are key influencers in explaining many identified shortcomings in the study due to their agenda, priorities, duration of the project (less than 1 year funding because it's an emergency/humanitarian funding). For instance, some donors have specific agendas such as the political agenda of the EU donors which is to create livelihood opportunities for the refugees to stay in Lebanon and not go to Europe. And some donors have specific requirements, for example, they define a job as a minimum of 60 working days in a row which is almost impossible in the context of Lebanon in particular in agriculture given the seasonality of work. In future similar studies, the donors should be the key stakeholders to be interviewed to understand their perspectives and their influence on the whole LCRP.

Feedback on **short term** recommendations:

- *Skills and training*: when the fad of focusing on vocational training started especially in agriculture there was a lot of ad-hoc approaches and lots of trainings that were not well structured and focused on thematic areas that are not very useful, but gradually things turned to be more coordinated. Mr. Saade mentioned a project implemented by FAO which tried to establish a coordination mechanism among all main agencies and NGOs working in this area. For example the issue of how much to pay for the trainees: different organizations would bring different rates and then decide finally to have a single fee so that organizations don't compete to attract trainees for short and long term trainings that were provided with the baccalaureate technique of the agriculture schools.
The curriculum was streamlined to make sure it's technically valid and this was done in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture. Also, a close collaboration was made with AVSI (INGO) which has a long experience in this area, to make sure that the trainings provided, particularly short term trainings, are technically solid and there's a good balance between theoretical and practical. This makes the certificates that the trainees receive whether Lebanese or Syrians become credible.
- *Beneficiaries' inclusion, profiling and solution procedures* recommendation was validated. The participation of refugees in the project design is instrumental whether Syrian or Lebanese. However, it can be difficult to implement when short term humanitarian projects dominate. This inclusion should be applied whenever possible timing and resources allow.
- Validated the recommendation of *coordination between agencies* working in Syria and in Lebanon. The report mentioned that FAO tried to coordinate with colleagues in Syria on vocational trainings so that whatever short term trainings conducted in Lebanon would fit into the needs in Syria. This was not pursued because of the situation in Syria but it is still something that FAO plans to do in coordination with FAO Syria country office.
- Coordination mechanism between *working groups*: the coordination between the Food security and livelihood working groups is a major challenge going on for many years since the LCRP coordination mechanism was established in 2014-2015. Although it was made clear that the food security and agriculture sector covers agriculture livelihoods and livelihood sector covers non-agriculture livelihoods. Unfortunately, this was never implemented even after many discussions with colleagues in the livelihood sector. The food security working group is co-led by MoA, WFP and FAO. The livelihood sector is co-led by MOSA, UNDP and ILO. The MoA is not present in the livelihood sector although there are a lot of agriculture livelihood activities conducted but without coordination with the MoA and also often without coordination with the food security sector. Part of the blame is also on donors because they push to put more resources in the livelihood sector since livelihood means creating more jobs even though many of the jobs have been created in the education sector (teachers) and with the WASH sector (irrigation, water systems etc). Coordination mechanism between the two working groups (food security & agriculture and livelihood sectors) needs definitely to be improved.
- Validated the recommendation on: the necessity of establishing a solid partnership to *empower grass-rooted organizations*. Unfortunately, the typical relationship between UN

agencies and INGOs on one hand and local NGOs on the other hand is a relationship of a code service provider. A service contract is signed with local NGOs to implement so the local NGOs has no say in the design of the project quite often, which is unfortunate because they have the experience and have the local knowledge.

FAO is now adopting a new modality which is a partnership agreement where NGOs and partners are involved in the design and implementation phase. This modality was applied with AVSI and other organizations. FAO is hoping to extend it to other partners in order to ensure more effective implementation and ownership and to benefit from the context-based knowledge of the local NGOs.

- *Local food sourcing*: this is not very feasible because the type of food produced in Lebanon may not be the ones needed for the refugees and also there are procurement and logistics issues.
- *Economic impact assessment* recommendation is validated yet not always feasible. The impact comes many years after the implementation of the project, it takes quite a time to take place and resources are often not there within the project budget. When designing a project, resources need to be allocated to measure at least the immediate impact in the final evaluation of the project and maybe come back few years later to do a program impact assessment. For example, there might be a need to have an impact assessment of the agriculture livelihood activities in Lebanon that could be conducted in the future.
- Validated the recommendation on *balancing Sustainable livelihoods assets*: FAO always focuses on ensuring that there's some physical assets associated with any training activity. In fact, whenever there is distribution of assets, FAO starts first with a training and make the training as a pre-requisite for the potential beneficiary to be eligible to acquire the assets (e.g. small tools, assets for dairy). For example, training on hygiene is provided before they can acquire the assets, because training itself without implementing is sometimes not very sustainable.

Feedback on long term recommendations:

- *Institutional support and advocacy*: FAO by its mandate is a key supporter of the MoA capacity building and policy support.
- Complementarity between *humanitarian and development dimensions*: easier said than done because of the different agendas between humanitarian and development agencies and since the LCRP is driven by humanitarian donors it's often short term. LCRP focused on immediate results and number of beneficiaries rather than the impact. FAO is a development organization but has an emergency program including distribution of inputs, tools, and productive assets. In the case of Lebanon, this is not possible because of the strict restrictions by the government, formally rejecting the distribution of productive assets to the Syrian refugees. Syrian refugees are expected to either work as labourers (not as producers), or to receive food assistance. That's why FAO focuses on the win-win approach which supports host communities and Syrian refugees. For example, FAO has a project on land reclamation where small farmers benefit from projects to build water reservoirs and land reclamation terracing etc. This work creates large number of short-term jobs for Syrian refugees in construction and in agriculture and also create sustainable jobs

in the future once this green land become productive (this is where the useful approach is in addition to public infrastructure projects).

- *Sustainability* recommendation validated: the source of funding is what drives the shortness of projects and the inability to invest in sustainability. Development agencies try to work on sustainability by using the funding available from the humanitarian donors and design activities that have more sustainable results.

B. Mr. Brian Wei – Head of Livelihoods – World Food Programme (WFP) – Lebanon

Mr. Wei congratulated the colleagues at ESCWA as this is a really vital report for refugees and host communities in Lebanon; and it helps in defining what assistance can better go to refugees and host communities in the future. He also indicated that it is also important for the reintegration of refugees to the country of origin when peace returns. Refugees' place of origin is Homs governorate which is predominantly agriculture based, this makes the study pertinent and very relevant to future immigration programming when peace returns.

Take over messages:

- Different programming should be defined as they have different outcomes. There are a lot of different livelihood programmes in Lebanon. Some programs of the FFT/FFA that WFP is implementing are more highly oriented towards meeting some of the food gaps that vulnerable household have on a short term basis. Other programs have a high emphasis on food assistance with elements of sustainability, and other programs have a high emphasis on supporting refugees in host communities towards formal and informal employment including supporting refugees to move all the way towards self-reliance. Depending on the outcome of different projects, there are also different approaches and different types of program deliveries.
- Livelihood projects can have very different outcomes 1) food assistance VS 2) sustainable livelihoods. So trying to use the DFID sustainable livelihoods framework for projects whose outcomes aimed at food assistance does not work.
- Agriculture is very important in the country of origin and country of asylum for many reasons: employment potential, agricultural background, geographical location in rural areas and legal regulatory environment for refugees working in Lebanon. As their country of origin is Homs, refugees' employment back in their country of origin is rural based and largely dependent upon agriculture.
- Agriculture is the largest sector for refugees in Lebanon (rural based) and likely largest sector upon return to Syria (also rural based).
- In Lebanon, there is an opportunity to see how basic primary cultivation can be improved but also to include additional value added off-farm activities including agri-food and other processing. Also, understanding how the technical skills of individuals into making that specific product can be improved as well as and how to enhance the overall packaging, food handling, safety, transportation and warehouse is important.
- Better organization: look beyond the individual, and look at what is the wider food system of producers through to consumers including the processors, transporters and retailers.

Encouraged to look at the agricultural space in the widest possible perspective, so beyond primary cultivation. Looking into secondary value chains such as the agri-food and agriculture inputs is important and they are job rich. In addition, look into the other types of agricultural activities that can be supported like livestock and small ruminants. The economic conditions in Lebanon are creating a necessity and opportunity for new types of secondary value chains and new subsectors to emerge. For instance, the depreciation of the local currency makes some approaches like import substitution or export-led promotion strategies more viable in this context.

- Look at what skills have the refugees acquired in their host communities since many refugees have moved to urban areas to access public services. It is crucial to understand what skills have they acquired that might be useful for them when they return to their country of origin. This might not necessarily be agriculture related. Look at the full spectrum of livelihood opportunities that can be promoted in Lebanon and in their country of origin.
- Better coordination: there is a great opportunity for coordination between the food security and the livelihood sectors around the agriculture space and beyond the information sharing. There's also an opportunity to see how synergies between projects, better joint advocacy and better joint programming can be improved. Also, it is necessary to work with donors and governments to push key priority areas that organizations/sectors identify as high priorities to promote some of the livelihood opportunities for participants.
- National capacity of NGOs is a key component. WFP believes that in addition to livelihood programming, secondary impacts in building partnership with national NGOs and working with local government cooperatives is an outcome by itself. Beyond the period of the project, building and strengthening these institutions is critical to ensuring sustainability in programs.
- There's a strong opportunity for local decentralization and strong opportunity for local government institutions. There are two main key points here 1) capacity of key government line ministries such as MoA 2) working with local municipalities. Improving the capacity of municipalities can lead community planning and ensure funding of projects.
- Policy space and advocacy with the government: see how organizations can push upon the legal regulatory work environment specifically for refugees. In Lebanon, it is limited to three specific sectors. It is the organizations' responsibility to bring the refugees along, to encourage the freedom of movement and the right to work. All of this is important not only for refugees in countries of asylum but also to the value they have to the wider ecosystem and supporting the Lebanese economy.
- Local sourcing: there are many different types of local sourcing 1) when WFP purchases food for in-kind parcels (retail shops) 2) engage in type of home grown school feeding. A lot of WFP partners work directly with local small farmers, local cooperatives and local businesses to procure local food. There are a lot of opportunities that can be strengthened to make sure that food purchased for direct food assistance programs can be procured from small farmers.

It is important to see how to balance between costs, because Lebanon is a high cost country but also to see how to use these local procurement processes as a catalyst for development.

- Mr. Wei thanked ESCWA for this important study, WFP will continue to see how it can support it and implement some of the strategies as recommended.

C. Ms. Nadja Nutz – Technical officer, Prospects Programme – International Labor Organization (ILO) – Lebanon

Ms. Nutz thanked the team for conducting this very interesting and comprehensive study. She also stated that she is working on a very specific programme called improving the prospects of host communities and forcibly displaced persons, where she coordinates a small component within the programme that is looking at the horticulture sector and ways to develop it for the benefit of both communities. The project has just started and has conducted a value chain assessment and market system analysis of the horticulture sector earlier this year.

Take over messages:

- Look at holistic approaches. Because when looking at the agriculture sector or any kind of livelihoods, it is found that people do not operate in isolation; the value chain actors are interconnected. Farmers in particular need inputs, markets, off takers and institutional support. Looking at the value chain and the system as a whole and how the actors are working together is really key. Right now all the actors are struggling, but at the end of the day the support measures should benefit the whole value chains and the whole system because it's not only farmers who are struggling it's also the input suppliers and the whole system. Look at ways to develop this holistic approaches that are based on thorough assessments of the sector and the challenges that different actors face.
- There is a need to create win-win situations for refugees and host communities. Traditionally, both communities, Lebanese as farmers and Syrians as workers, have found livelihoods in the agricultural sector. It is important not to support one group at the detriment of the other groups. Supporting farmers to maintain agricultural production and grow their farms would also benefit workers.
- ILO has an interest in creating not just livelihoods, but decent livelihoods, jobs and working conditions for both groups. For instance, increasing the productivity of the farm while also improving the working conditions on the farms, like helping farmers use pesticides correctly can positively impact the working conditions on the farm.
- How to deal with the rapidly changing environment? There are several crises impacting the sector, farmers and workers right now. For example, the study mentioned that input prices have risen drastically and farmers are struggling to continue agricultural production.
- To keep up with the rapidly changing situation, there is a need to constantly monitor the changes as they happen by the day and by the week. It is important for the different organizations to constantly share the studies, the information and the assessments that they conduct. There should be solid coordination between the organizations in this area.
- ILO is about to launch a survey with farmers, workers and wholesalers in the horticulture sector that will be shared when the findings come in.
- Dividing the recommendations into short term and long term responses is very important. How to coordinate between the humanitarian and development nexus? It is easier said than

done; organizations should work on both things in parallel. It is more than just coordinating the transition from a humanitarian response to a development response, work should be done on both of them together. In fact, what farmers, actors and workers need now is immediate and direct support to cope with the crisis, sustain agriculture production and to make sure not to lose all these jobs in the agriculture sector.

- It is also important to work on more long term responses to develop the sector, raise productivity and make it more competitive and fit for export to encourage more job creation in the long run.

D. Mr. Ibrahim Hawi – Minister Advisor – Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) – Lebanon

Mr. Hawi congratulated ESCWA for this fruitful and comprehensive report which is one of the rarely cases that tackle needs at the ground and beneficiary levels and not only at national level. He also indicated that the assessment is conducted in a very good way reflecting the needs at farmer and beneficiary levels.

Take over messages:

- Lebanon has been severely affected by the Syrian conflict, and a protracted conflict like this affects income generating opportunities and reduces the employment level. A lot of work should be done to find the balance between demand and supply. In order to create a skilled person in agriculture, a labour market assessment focusing on all the different nodes of the value chains need to done.
- It is still hard to find a skilled farmer capable of doing many things at the same time (e.g.; spraying pests, pruning etc).
- After several years of the conflict, a lot of work has been done, but there's still a need for a more focused approach on the need of the sector and it is good to differentiate between livelihood as a whole sector and the agricultural sector.
- Coordination from the point of view of MoA: the coordination needs to be improved. Monitoring and integrating the efforts while taking into consideration the limited resources in the country right now is important. The more the value of resources is increased, the more this leads to increasing the impact of intervention.
- It is also crucial to work on the regional coordination and triangulate it with the national level.
- Many of the recommendations in the report are tangible and realistic, because the assessment values the voice of the beneficiary very well. However, in terms of vocational training, many things still need to be improved including the methodology, curriculum and maybe the topic itself, in order for all implementers not to repeat the same trainings for the participants.
- MoA with the support of FAO and in a project aiming to upgrade the agricultural technical training system in Lebanon are trying to implement a work-based training and work-based learning.

- Recommendation: creating a network and engaging the private sector is very essential. The private sector should be part of the whole process from the design to the implementation of the program.
- There is a need to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation frameworks. There is a need to work on the impact of the programs on the job creation and to track how contribution improves the livelihood of the beneficiaries. Also, there is a need to track and prioritize the skills which allow refugees to work not only in Lebanon but also in Syria during the post conflict period.

IV. Discussion

Q&A

The second session was followed by a Q&A where participants have raised the following issues:

- Q1: How many Syrian refugees can the agriculture sector in Lebanon absorb because there is over a million refugees in Lebanon?
A1: The intention is not to absorb all refugees in the agriculture sector. During the peak agriculture season, the demand for skilled refugees is higher than the supply. The point is not to absorb all refugees in Lebanon but to provide a win-win situation in productive measures. According to ILO, the total number of Syrian labor force is around 200,000 and according to FAO unofficial estimate, those working in agriculture are around 80,000. This is a low number given the size of the labor force. The other major employer is the construction sector.
- Q2: Knowing the low budget of the MoA, how did the ministry engage the actors in food security and livelihood working groups in the development of the new agriculture strategy and how does the programming that is happening fit with the priorities in general?
A: The MoA has elaborated a new strategy. MoA is contacting different donors and different interlocutors for the implementation phase.

General Remarks:

- The inter-agency sector coordinators under the LCRP should be engaged in the future validation process.
- The livelihood sector is not the least funded sector under the LCRP.
- Some of the findings in the study are reflected in the LRCP 2021 sector strategies.
- ILO is not leading the livelihood sector but a key actor under the sector. MoA is in the livelihood sector steering committee.
- As of this year and next year, the food security and livelihood sectors are doing joint meetings at national level on supporting agriculture and agro-food cooperative along with the MoA and the general directorate of cooperatives. This way can ensure better coordination.

- At regional level, there are full-time livelihood sector coordinators. In the case of the food security sector, it is part time but soon it will be full time.
- At regional level, the food security and the livelihood sectors are working closely together to create a platform where partners can meet, share info to avoid duplication and ensure better harmony between different interventions.

V. End of Meeting

Ms. Reem Nejdawi and Mr. Elias Ghadban thanked participants and speakers for their time to validate the study and for their valuable comments which will be incorporated into the final report and shared with all participants.