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I. Executive summary

The objective of this assessment is to understand the actual living conditions of displaced people and returnees in Benghazi. As such, this assessment does not provide an overview of the damage in Benghazi but more a snapshot of the actual living conditions of the population. The main focus are the dwelling conditions and security of tenure in urban areas. Additional information was collected on civil documentation and on access to assistance and information.

The scope of the assessment does not include camp or collective sites.

468 interviews have been conducted in 6 neighbourhoods: Al-Salmani (IDPs sample, taken from Libaid list), Benghazi-Al Jadida (al Leithy), Benina, Qnfodah, Sidi Hussein and Garyounes.

Samples were selected in a random, geographically spread and population-proportionate fashion across each neighbourhood so that they can be representative of the overall situation in a neighbourhood.

Data collection was done by NRC partner Libaid from March 1st until 12th 2018.

Level of damage of inhabited buildings

Overall 30% of the households are living in building with some damage\(^1\), including 9% living in buildings with substantial damage and 1% in buildings with severe damage—these dwellings would need some work to be weatherproof and healthy to live in. Moreover, there are strong variations per area. Benina and Qnfodah have about a quarter of their population in dwellings with substantial or severe damage. It is 11% in Benghazi-Al Jadida, which is much less but the area is much more populated.

The majority of the respondents who own a dwelling (either where they currently live or in their areas of origin) started some repair—anecdotally from very minor to substantial investment. Key informants have consistently mentioned three key issues: the lack of labour as foreign workers left because of the conflict, the poor quality and high costs of available materials and the difficulty for people to access liquidity. Some key informants reported a tripling of the cost of construction material. Some identify people who rent as vulnerable as they may be unlikely to spend money on rehabilitating their original house, as they have to disburse money for their rent.

**Housing tenure arrangement:**

Almost all the returnees (97%) and non-displaced (93%) interviewees own the dwelling where they live. It is the opposite for the IDPs, only 6% of them own their current dwelling. 65% of the IDPs interviewed currently rent, 22% are hosted for free, and the remaining 13% are split between people who own their dwelling and a few others who are occupying empty houses.

Only 7% of interviewed households reported being able to pay the rent on time without problem. 85% of the ones who face some difficulties to pay the rent borrow money/contract debt. 8% negotiate time with the owner (including to overcome the continued challenges of cash liquidity).

Understanding the mechanism to contract debt or borrow money would require further work, as well as ultimately how much of a negative coping strategy it may be.

90% of the IDPs renting have a verbal agreement: more than half have no certainty for how long they will be able to stay. Only a third are confident they could stay for more than a year, and when asked to qualify how confident they are, half of them said “not sure at all” and 20% said “extremely sure”.

---

\(^1\) A damaged building that has been repaired has been considered without damage or with minor damages depending on what remains to be repaired.
This shows at least a very “fluid” concept of tenure security for those with oral agreements – uncertainty, no set duration. It should be further explored to conclude whether it is an issue.

**Evictions:**
Four families stated they have been under threat of eviction over the last 6 months (out of over 112 households that do not own their current dwelling). They are all renting their current dwelling. The assessment did not come across people being hosted for free under threat of eviction in the last 6 months.

**Civil documentation:**
23% of the respondents reported issues to obtain or renew some of their documents –10% of the IDPs. As the question about issues renewing documentation was not formulated to be time bound, it is not possible to know when or where the IDPs tried to renew their documents, or whether returnees faced any issues in renewing since they have been back or while they were displaced. **The fact that about 20% of the IDPs and of the returnees report difficulties to obtain their “national number” may be a matter of concern as this document is essential to access social services.**

**Access to information:**
40% of the people would like to have information on assistance, and 34% on how to access basic services. It seems therefore that there is a gap in information provision. Other requests for more information were related to demining and reconstruction. Particularly respondents from Qnfodah requested information on demining (40% of them) and to a lesser extent respondents from Garyounes and Benina (20% of them, especially those who have heard of a mine incident recently). People stated that they prefer to receive information by television, SMS, social media and radio to a lesser extent. This is common across categories of respondents.

**Vulnerability of the population:**
57% of the households interviewed have a household member with a serious health issue (chronic disease, disability). Respectively 12% and 15% of the female-headed households and the male-headed households have more than one person with a health issue in the household. **Access to money was consistently reported as a top concern across neighbourhoods and regardless of displacement category for 97% of the respondents.** For the non-IDPs sample, the three next concerns are the lack of assistance, the lack of jobs and the difficult access to health services. The ranking of these three criteria vary from one neighbourhood to another. Moreover, for Al-Salmani (respondents being 95% IDPs), the lack of jobs, difficult access to health services and security are the major concerns that comes after the lack of money. However, the fact that more than half of the owners stated they have started to repair their dwellings may be seen as a proxy for a certain level of resilience.
Areas for further research

- Understanding the potential push/pull factors for people who are still currently IDPs. This should include assessing the importance of the level of damage of the dwelling as well as the household’s capacity to repair. It would help gauging the best options between support to reconstruction or cash for rent (which is one of the actual topics discussed within the shelter working group). Such study is also necessary to make sure that internationally supported repair programme would not discourage IDPs’ own initiatives.

- Assessing the living conditions and housing arrangement of people in collective sites, including the security of tenure.

- Understanding whether the fact that tenants have hardly a perspective on how long they would be able to stay in a given dwelling is a factor of vulnerability and if so how could it be mitigated.

- Understanding better the mechanism to contract debt or borrow money to pay the rent to assess how much of a negative coping strategy it may be.

- This assessment show that 20% of the people face difficulties to obtain their national number. Understanding the challenges, actual or perceived and addressing them is important to support the process as this document is critical to access other rights and services. This should be expanded to include people currently displaced outside their cities of origin.
II. About the assessment

Purpose of the assessment

Benghazi is the Baladiya (Municipality) in Libya with the highest number of IDPs (41,450 individuals) and returnees (159,000 individuals). The last Multi Sectorial Needs Assessment (REACH, September 2017) shows that 18% of IDPs and 8% of returnees are living in unfinished buildings. 27% of IDPs and 38% of returnees are also living in damaged buildings. Many IDPs struggle to pay the rent and 9% are at risk of eviction.

The Shelter and NFI Working Group enables better coordination among all shelter actors, including local and international organisations and national authorities. As part of its 2018 strategy, the Shelter and NFI Working Group intends to ensure adequate, appropriate and affordable housing options for the most vulnerable people and households. Understanding needs and vulnerabilities is key to improve the sector response. In order to be prepared, the Shelter Sector has partnered with NRC to conduct a Shelter and HLP (Housing Land and Property rights) technical needs assessment to collect more information and concrete data to better understand the living conditions and challenges faced by the returnees and the IDPs in Benghazi.

The results of this assessment will feed into planning for effective shelter and HLP responses by prioritizing the needs and supporting the most vulnerable populations. As such, it is important to note that the assessment does not focus on the most structurally and physically damaged areas of Benghazi but rather on the areas that have witnessed the highest number of returns –being the areas assumed to be most conducive to return, so not the worst areas.
Methodology

The assessment aims to collect information on two populations of interest: IDPs and returnees (including other conflict-affected people of concern) in Benghazi. The geographic areas selected for inclusion in the assessment are neighbourhoods of Benghazi that IOM and other humanitarian partners such as REACH report to house a high number of returnees and IDPs. Together, the assessment includes 468\(^2\) household interviews, designed to represent these populations of interest within the geographic areas included in the assessment.

Given the patterns of displacement and return, as well as the techniques required for identifying members of the population of interest, we divided the assessment into two parts. In the first component, NRC and its partner sampled 386\(^3\) households from five neighbourhoods identified as housing a large proportion of returnees and other conflict-affected people of concern. We refer to this as the ‘returnee sample’. In the second component, NRC sampled 100\(^4\) IDP households, derived from a list of IDPs maintained by Libaid, living in two neighbourhoods with a high number of IDPs. We refer to this as the ‘IDP sample’.

Questionnaires consisted of questions about needs, area of origin and displacement, current living conditions and the state of the dwelling households are living in. As the level of damage is not easy to define and in order to limit the subjectivity, enumerators were asked to identify the most relevant from a series of relatively objective descriptive statements about walls, roofs, windows/doors and toilets. Pictures of damage were taken and double-checked by one person to make sure each team has the same understanding of what are minor, substantial or severe damages. Then the agglomerate estimate of the level of damage was done by the same person.

Team

The Libaid team conducted the assessment, with the support of the NRC team. The Libaid team consisted of 16 enumerators (8 males and 8 females, working in mixed pairs). They were trained for 2 days, then had a one-day test phase in real conditions followed by another day of debriefing and adjustment of the questionnaire. Libaid also provided an assessment coordinator, who was the focal point for the NRC team in Benghazi and in Tunis.

NRC had two staff supporting the assessment. Their tasks included spot checks with the enumerators, daily debriefings with the teams and daily feedback to the NRC Shelter Specialist in Tunis.

\(^2\) 468 interviewed/visits were kept out of 537. Some interviews were carried out to test the questionnaire others were removed as some answers where not coherent.  
\(^3\) 376 were kept, 10 removed.  
\(^4\) 94 interviews were kept, 6 removed
Definitions

Household: one or more people who live in the same dwelling and also share meals or living accommodation; and may consist of a single family or some other grouping of people.

Returnee: someone who has been displaced but has returned to the same house of origin.

Non-conflict related displacement: people who have been displaced but not because of the conflict. In case any displacement was due to conflict, households were categorised as IDPs.

Level of damage: Evaluation of the general condition of the house was done in a way to enable non-expert enumerators to evaluate damage and to limit a subjective appreciation. The overall level of damage was assessed based on pictures and specific qualification of four items being the roof, the walls, the windows and door, and last the access to functioning toilets. Additional criteria were added for rooms/dwellings that have been burnt or that are in a dilapidated state. Damage level was split in four categories: no or negligible, minor, substantial and severe damage. Data and picture were finally reviewed to ensure meaningful categorisation for example in order not to put on an equal footing a new house with some bullet holes and an old house with dilapidated walls. (More details pages 15-17)

Data collection, monitoring and data cleaning

Questionnaires were prepared by NRC Specialists in Shelter and ICLA (Information, Counselling and Legal Assistance).

Questionnaires in Arabic were loaded in Kobo on smart phones. Data were uploaded at the end of every day by every field team to allow regular data cleaning and corrections. Technologies allowed for geolocation and duration monitoring of each interview.

As far as the assessment of damage is concerned, each interview documents respectively damages in the ceiling, walls, doors and windows with 2 pictures for each category. Each interview also has a generic picture of the outside of the house.
Justification for the areas

OVERVIEW

Areas were chosen based on available information from the IOM DTM, crossed check by information from ACTED rapid assessment and REACH 2017 MSNA. Main criteria were presence of returnees or IDPs, level of damage, absence of mines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>IDPs who left Muhalla</th>
<th>Returnees</th>
<th>IDPs in Muhalla</th>
<th>Migrants in Muhalla</th>
<th>Fighting-related damages (from different sources)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Salmani</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Minor damages</td>
<td>Areas with still a large population of IDPs, some are living in damaged building (2017 REACH MSNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi Al Jadida (Al Leithy)</td>
<td>102,732</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>50,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>Also called Al Leithy. Big neighbourhood. Residential houses and apartment blocks. Quite densely populated. Some areas heavily damaged. High return rate according to IOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benina</td>
<td>10,737</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>Heavily damaged area (close to the airport). High number of returnees according to IOM. Two areas are considered slums with a likely high percentage of vulnerable families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garyounes</td>
<td>15,146</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Heavy damages, UXOs</td>
<td>Close to the university of Benghazi with apartment blocks and houses. Fighting happened in this neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qnfodah</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Heavy damages, UXOs</td>
<td>Area where fighting happened in 2017, so not so many returnees yet (around 10%) and returns are quite recent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Hussein</td>
<td>20,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Area where there is a mixed population of IDPs, returnees, and non-displaced. In this area, there are also apartment blocks that suffer from lack of maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINES

UXO-related incidents are still happening.

Qnfodah stands out as the neighbourhood with the largest number of reported incidents. Almost half of the people interviewed have heard about incidents due to mine/unexploded ordnance in the past 6 months.

---

5 Figures from the Bureau of Statistics (individuals) – 6 Information from IOM (individuals)
Maps of the samples and number of interviews

IDP SAMPLE
92 interviews

SIDI HUSSEIN
55 interviews

AL JADIDA (AL LEITHY)
185 interviews

GARYOUNES
48 interviews

GNEFODAH
81 interviews

BENINA
57 interviews
Sampling

General sample: At the most general level, the assessment aimed to collect information on the returnee population in Benghazi. However, given the dispersal of the returnee population throughout a densely populated urban environment, we focused our sampling on five neighbourhoods with an estimated population of returnees: Benina, Garyounes, Sidi Hussein, Benghazi Al Jadida (Al Leithy), Qnfodah. We included all residents of these neighbourhoods as potential interviewees in the sample. We divided these neighbourhoods into polygons based on the estimated return population size (based on the population, and type and density of the housing stock) and proportionally sampled households from each polygon. Given the small size of the polygons, with the exception of one, we asked the enumerators to go to the centre of the polygon (using offline maps including the sample polygons on mobile phones) and divide the number of households to be interviewed by the cardinal points on the compass (north, south, east, and west). For example, if the protocol stated that the enumerators should interview 12 households in the polygon, then the enumerators divided 12 by 4 and determined that they must each interview 3 households in each direction. If the polygon is predominantly made up of large apartment buildings, the enumerators could select one apartment building for each direction of the compass and then randomly select one floor of the apartment building and then interview households until they had interviewed the total for the cardinal direction. If the polygon is largely free standing or single-storey buildings, the enumerators could select one road for each direction of the compass and then interview households along the road until they had interviewed the total for that cardinal direction given the sample size for that polygon. If the enumerators interviewed less than four households in a given polygon, they could start with one of the cardinal directions and conduct one interview in each direction until they had met the total for that polygon. The number of interviews was based on the estimated population. As the geographical area of the estimated population from IOM is not defined, the density of population was calculated based on the number of buildings per Hectare, height and type of building. Eventually, 374 interviews were conducted.
**IDP sample**

At the most general level, this assessment aims to collect information on the IDP population in Benghazi. However, given the challenges in accessing this population, IDPs were randomly sampled from lists maintained by Libaid. As such, our sample is representative of IDPs that have contact with Libaid, in the neighbourhoods in Benghazi where Libaid operates. Enumerators initially telephoned 579 people out of which 264 could not be reached (phone off, phone number that does not exist anymore, etc.). Here the summary of the calls with the remaining 316 calls, where eventually 92 were interviewed.

Once the data were collected, respondents have been categorised according to their actual displacement history. Five cases from Libaid’s list were categorised as returnees (4) and non-displaced (1). From the other samples in the five muhallas, 21 households were found as having gone through displacement because of conflict. As a result, the total IDP sample is 108 households.

**Final sample**

The final sample consists of 468 interviews, 108 of them being IDPs.

---

6 In accordance with the definition set out above for the purposes of this assessment.
Challenges and limitations

Given the lack of updated data attached to a geographical area, the sampling was based on an estimated number of inhabitants per selected neighbourhood estimated from satellite imagery-based housing density.

There was a trade-off between the usefulness of data and the length and complexity of the questionnaire. As such, little information was collected related to dates—other than the date of initial displacement. Therefore, there is no information about how long people have been displaced or when people actually returned. Similarly, questions on civil documentation and the challenges to renew them were not tied to a location. So, if a returnee reported that he/she faced an issue to renew a certain document, no conclusion can be drawn on the place/date when this actually happened.

Enumerators were trained by two NRC consultants who had received an initial training. These two consultants provided daily support and monitoring for the assessment. The remote nature of the supervision is a weakness, as well as the limited previous exposure of the teams to assessments. This was mitigated by a series of measures (daily debriefing, daily data upload and cleaning, etc.).

The « displacement categories » are based on the actual displacement history as told by the interviewees—and are considered “returnees” people who have returned to their house of origin. It creates a grey zone for people who had their initial displacement for another reason than conflict. For instance, people who moved in 2013 to find a bigger house but then who had to flee in 2014 because of conflict: they are very unlikely to come back to the house they live in pre-2013. The questionnaire does not allow for such a level of detail. However, there are only four such cases. The same goes for the IDPs who were renting their houses in 2011—if that house was destroyed, it is unlikely that they feel compelled to return to that specific house. However, return intentions reported are very mixed and the majority of respondents still states they would want to return to it. These people therefore kept under the « IDPs » category.

In the course of the assessment, despite many efforts, enumerators could not have access to sample areas of Al-Leithy neighbourhood in Benghazi-Al-Jadida for cited reasons of safety and security. So the initial sample in this neighbourhood was redirected to Sidi Hussein neighbourhood.
III. Overview of sample demographics

In total, 468 questionnaires were kept for the analysis. 82% have been assessed by the enumerators with a high reliability and 18% with a medium credibility.

Two thirds of the respondents were the heads of the households. When it was not the head of the households, it was the wife of the male head of household in 50% of the cases, a son in 30% of the cases and a daughter in 20% of the cases. There are two cases where it is someone from the extended family who responded (when the head of the household was a male). In the case of the interviews made after appointments (so the 95 IDPs), the interviewee is the head of the household in 91% of the cases.

Overall, 75% of the households sampled were headed by a man, and 25% by a woman, with limited variation to the average per status/displacement history\(^7\). The age of the head of household is on average 55—and 56 for women heads of households.

Six households interviewed were non-Libyans – two were from Sudan, two from Palestine, one from Egypt and one from Syria. One of the six was on the Libaid lists and was an IDP family. The other were met during the random sampling: one was still displaced, two had returned to their homes, one was never displaced and one has moved houses for reason unrelated to conflict.

On average, the household size is six, with two individuals being younger than 18. There is very little difference by status/displacement history but there is a more telling one with the gender of the head of households with female-headed households tending to have smaller-size households.

More than half of the households interviewed (57%) have a household member with a serious health issue (chronic disease, disability). There is no difference with displacement history. There seems to be a difference with the gender of the head of household as 73% of women-headed households have a household member with a health issue (and 56% for the male-headed household). Respectively 12% and 15% of the female-headed households and the male-headed households have more than one person with a health issue in the household.

About a third of the households sampled had a member who is older than 65. 3% of the woman-headed households and 10% of the male-headed households have more than one member older than 65.

\(^7\) Ratio male-headed HH to woman-headed HH being 80/20 for the returnees, 77/23 for the non-displaced and 72/28 for the IDPs. It is not statistically significant.
IV. Damages and living conditions

Categorisation of damage

ESTIMATE

To determine the level of damage of the house, the enumerators looked at the general state of three items of the building: the roof, the walls and the doors/windows (see details next page). Enumerators chose one of the four levels of damage: no damage, minor damage, moderate damage, or severe damage. For each item, they looked at the damages but also if it affected only a part or the whole building.

Water and sanitation criteria were taken into account:

- state of the water system inside the dwelling (functioning, partially functioning and not functioning);
- the type of toilet (flush toilet, pour toilet, no toilet); and
- dwelling has at least one toilet functioning or not.

Moreover, additional criteria were used, like burnt room/dwelling or dilapidated dwelling.

Evaluation of the general condition of the house was done in a way to enable non-expert enumerators to evaluate damage and to limit a subjective appreciation. Data and picture were reviewed to ensure meaningful categorisation in order to for example not put on an equal footing a new house with some bullet holes and an old house with dilapidated walls.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOF</th>
<th>WALLS</th>
<th>DOORS / WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO DAMAGE</strong></td>
<td>No holes, no sign of water leakage</td>
<td>Very few broken glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MINOR DAMAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roof is leaking in some part of the building. It is possible to see evidence of water leakages. Nevertheless, there is no visible hole or crack in the roof.</td>
<td>Non-structural cracks on the walls, several bullet holes that can be easily repaired. Air is not going through the holes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MODERATE DAMAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some holes or large cracks in the roof. Rain is coming inside the dwelling.</td>
<td>Holes in many parts of the walls. It is possible to see through them. Some minor cracks on the columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEVERE DAMAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are large holes in the roof. The Roof would be very difficult to repair.</td>
<td>Large holes in many walls, major cracks in some columns, some walls completely destroyed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW OF CATEGORIES

Five categories have been used to determine the level of damage and the condition of the house, based on the combination of the state of the roof, walls, doors/windows, water and sanitation system and healthiness (rooms burnt or very dilapidated).

NO DAMAGE/NEGLIGEABLE DAMAGE means that the house is in good condition, it provides a good protection against the elements and the water and, sanitation system is functioning. A dwelling with a window glass broken, a minor impact of bullets or old painting would be part of this category.

MINOR DAMAGE means that several walls, doors and/or windows are damaged (including small holes, water leakages, etc.). Water system may be only partly functioning. It may include dilapidated buildings.

SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGES means that many parts of the dwelling are damaged. Walls/roofs can have big holes. This category includes dwellings with rooms with all windows blown away or rooms completely burnt. Some rooms could still be liveable.

SEVERE DAMAGES means that most of the doors and windows are badly damaged or destroyed. There are large holes in many walls, some could be completely destroyed. The building does not protect against the elements, the roof can have several large holes. Also water and sanitation system is affected, living conditions inside such building are difficult and unhealthy.

DESTROYED BUILDING is not part of the categories as it would not be possible to live in. This assessment focused only on occupied buildings. We have not interviewed any family living in a tent next to destroyed building.
Findings on the level of damage

As mentioned in the objectives of the assessment, the goal was not to estimate the number of damaged or destroyed buildings but to understand if people are living in damaged or inadequate buildings. Overall 70% of the households are living in buildings with no or negligible damage. 9% are living in buildings with substantial damage and 1% in buildings with severe damage—these dwellings would need some work to be weatherproof and healthy to live in. Moreover, there are strong variations per area. Benina and Qnfordah have about a quarter of their population in dwellings with substantial or severe damage. It comes to 11% in Benghazi-Al Jadida, which is much less but the area is much more populated. It does not make sense to compare per status as damages vary in function of the neighbourhood and by design the IDP sample was taken in Al Salmani.

---

8 A damaged building that has been repaired has been considered without damage or with minor damages depending on what remains to be repaired.
Examples of various level of damage

⚠️ Those pictures give an overview different level of damages and repairs done. They do not show houses that are in good conditions.

Apartment block under repair

House with severe damages and quick repairs

House with substantial damages and quick repairs

Large house with some important repairs on first and second floors. Last floor has not been repaired yet
Part of the house burnt where owner has started to clean and repair

Surrounding wall destroyed and house with substantial damages

Interior of a dilapidated house

Interior of a house where walls have started to be repaired
Water and sanitation

Access to water and sanitation system is related to the level of infrastructures in each neighbourhood – from key informants, some being already stretched before the conflict. Conflict and displacement have led to non-planned urbanization that makes such issues even more acute. Qnfodah is the neighbourhood where the access to safe water is reported as being the most difficult. Further investigations would be necessary to know if this is due to lack of infrastructures or damages due to the conflict. People getting water from wells are living in the same part of Qnfodah or Benina. Most of people getting water from water trucking are living in one neighbourhood of Qnfodah.

Regarding Garyounes the assessment shows that access to water in the sample assessed is good. However, 33% of interviewees of Garyounes mentioned that access to water is one of the top three concerns in this neighbourhood.

On the other hand, it seems that the relation between sharing of toilets/latrines is more a factor of hosting additional people in one’s house and not a consequence of damage. There is no specific characteristics of the people who share toilets or kitchen – in terms of gender of the head of household, household size or displacement category. Note that out of the 42 households who share their toilets, 40 also share their kitchen. 26 households share their kitchen and not the toilets and two households share their toilets and not the kitchen. People share the kitchen with the extended family (cousin, uncle, mother in law...).
Condition of toilets per neighbourhood

- **Not functioning**: 1%, 3%, 2%, 2%, 5%
- **Partially functioning**: 11%, 98%, 23%
- **Functioning**: 88%, 95%

Share toilets and kitchen

- **Share toilet with more than 4 people**
  - al salmani: 0%
  - Benghazi Al Jadida: 5%
  - Benina: 10%
  - Garyounes: 15%
  - Qnfodah: 20%
  - Sidi Hussein: 25%
- **Share toilet with less than 4 people**
  - al salmani: 0%
  - Benghazi Al Jadida: 0%
  - Benina: 0%
  - Garyounes: 0%
  - Qnfodah: 0%
  - Sidi Hussein: 0%
- **Share kitchen**
  - al salmani: 0%
  - Benghazi Al Jadida: 0%
  - Benina: 0%
  - Garyounes: 0%
  - Qnfodah: 0%
  - Sidi Hussein: 0%
Repair

The majority of the respondents who own a dwelling (either where they currently live or in their areas of origin) reported that they have started some repair. This cannot be qualified as there is no data on the amount invested in repairs. Key informants have consistently mentioned three key issues: the lack of labour as foreign workers left because of the conflict, the poor quality and high costs of available materials and the difficulty for people to access liquidity. Some key informants reported a tripling of the cost of construction material. Some identify people who rent as vulnerable as they would be unlikely to spend money on rehabilitating their original house, as they have to disburse money for their rent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner that have started to repair/rebuild</th>
<th>IDP</th>
<th>non_displaced</th>
<th>returnee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners who have started to repair/rebuild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benghazi Al Jadida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garyounes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qnfodah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Hussein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returnee</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non_displaced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returnee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 3 concerns per neighbourhood

Access to money was consistently reported as a top concern across neighbourhoods and regardless of displacement category for 97% of the respondents. For the non-IDPs sample, the three next concerns are the lack of assistance, the lack of jobs and the difficult access to health services. The ranking of these three criteria vary from one neighbourhood to another. Moreover, for Al-Salmani (respondents being 95% IDPs), the lack of jobs, difficult access to health services and security are the major concerns that comes after the lack of money. It is likely that the lack of assistance is less of an issue as the sample was taken from Libaid lists. The lack of jobs stands out more in this sample as well, possibly related to the need of cash to pay rent. Lastly, the IDPs of Al-Salmani reported higher concerns related to security.
V. Housing, land and property rights

Dwelling and occupation arrangement

Almost all the returnees (97%) and non-displaced (93%) interviewees own the dwelling where they live. It is the opposite for the IDPs, only 6% of them own their current dwelling. 66% of the IDPs currently rent and 23% are hosted for free, and the remaining 13% are split between people who own their dwelling and a few others are occupying empty houses with some level of community support.
IDPs and their houses of origin

Out of the 108 IDPs respondents, 88 own their house of origin, 16 were renting and four were hosted for free. All the 88 owners state they have documents to prove the ownership of the place of origin. Only 13% percent of the IDPs mentioned that their dwelling of origin is not damaged. 78% think it is not possible to live in. Such level of damage is only indicative as houses of origin have not been visited during this assessment.
Renting

RENTAL TENURE ARRANGEMENTS

Focusing on the IDPs who rent their current dwelling (80), **90% have a verbal agreement with the landlord** and 9% have a written agreement—which may be similar to non IDPs, but the sample of non-IDPs renting is too small to concluded this. All households with a written agreement (6) said they have a copy of it. Such a low proportion could be explained by some persistence of the Law 11/1992 that states that “lease of residences in Libya is prohibited” –as a way to enforce Gadhafi’s policy to provide a residence for every citizen. It could also be because people might be renting from family or friends or for a variety of other reasons. More detailed assessment would be necessary to understand the low number of written lease agreements reported.

Focus on the IDPs renting with only a verbal agreement: **more than half have no certainty for how long they will be able to stay.** Only a third are confident they could stay for more than a year, and when asked to qualify how confident they are, half of them said “not sure at all” and 20% said “extremely sure”.

This shows at least a very “fluid” concept of tenure security for those with oral agreements – uncertainty, no set duration. It should be further explored to conclude whether it is an issue.
RENT AMOUNTS

The sample shows 80 people renting their current dwelling. 89% of them are IDPs, so the data below are mainly on Al Salmani and cannot be extrapolated to other areas or disaggregated per displacement status. 44% of tenants said they pay 500 LYD per month. 29% pay between 600 and 700 LYD. Rents are higher for apartments than for houses—data do not allow for explanation. It is not possible to know what this represents as rent burden for vulnerable families as there is no reliable data on other expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People renting per category of displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDP 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non displaced 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returnee 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non conflict-related displaced people 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent prices (LYD)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There does not seem to be any practice of handing out receipts for payment of rent, as only one household out of 70 mentioned receiving a receipt against payment (that is one household who is paying the rent on a quarterly basis), and three additional mentioning they would get a receipt “sometimes”. In almost 20% of the cases, households had to provide a downpayment of two or three months. Usually, rent is paid on a monthly basis—the sample show two cases of quarterly payment and one flexible option of paying when cash is available.

Utilities are usually included in the rent: only one case reported paying electricity in addition to the rent—and another case reported paying bills for water in addition to the rent.

Only 7% households reported being able to pay the rent on time. 85% of the ones who face difficulties to pay the rent borrow money/contract debt. 8% negotiate time with the owner (including to overcome the liquidity issue). Understanding the mechanism to contract debt or borrow money would require further work, as well as ultimately how much of a negative coping strategy it may be.

EVICTION

Five families mentioned that they have been evicted in the course of their displacement, all at times when they were renting a place. All of them are male-headed households and Libyans. Four families stated they have been under threat of eviction over the last six months (out of over 112 households that do not own their current dwelling). One is because the landlord wants a higher rent, one is because he cannot afford the rent anymore and the two others are cases where the landlord wants the place for his/her personal use. Three families are currently displaced because of the conflict and one is not conflict-related displaced. Three are male-headed households and one is a woman-headed household. All of them are Libyans.

There is no reported threats/experience of eviction when people are hosted for free.
VI. Civil documentation

In 97% of the cases, all the adults of the households sampled had an ID document (2% did not, and 1% did not know). Note the obvious limitations in the question asking whether all adults had one ID —but not specifying which type of document. As it is only 11 cases of the entire sample who reported having no ID, split across all categories (gender, displacement status, house conditions, neighbourhoods), no further broken down analysis is possible. Overall, there is no particular difference in the possession of civil documentation per status of displacement. It also appears that people have a variety of documents at hand — though it cannot be determined which family members have which documents because the question was not specific to one individual but encompassing all the household members. Further detailed assessment would be necessary to understand this more.

23% of the respondents reported facing issues to obtain or renew some of the documents — this includes 10% of the IDPs. As the question about issues renewing documentation is not time bound, it is not possible to know when or where the IDPs tried to renew, nor whether the returnees had issues in renewing since they are back or while they were displaced. As noted, further assessments would be needed to understand which documents are difficult to renew, who is affected and what the obstacles are (perceived or actual).
From the data, people in Qnfodah, Sidi Hussein and Benina have faced the biggest difficulty, with one household out of three that reported challenges in obtaining or renewing some ID. About one out of four households currently in Al Jadida and Garyounes have faced difficulty and only 8% of the respondents living in Al Salmani. The major issue is related to the renewal of passports but other challenges are faced when it comes to the ID card, the national number or the family booklet. As far as passports are concerned: since 2011, passports' issuance has become linked to an e-booking system that tends to get clogged by the numerous requests. Consequently, people do struggle to get an appointment. Family booklets are no longer issued due to a shortage in tamper official paper. Instead, the head of household is usually handed a document stating that the family booklet process is under way.

Respondents agree that the most useful document is the family booklet followed by the national number. This is indeed normal, as the family booklet is the fundamental document that then paves the way for the ID number. These two documents are required to access some services as well as the state pension. The fact that about 20% of the IDPs and of the returnees struggle to obtain the national number would warrant further investigation.
VII. Movements of population

About 75% of the people who have been displaced because of conflict (so IDPs and returnees) have been displaced only once—not counting the return movement for people who have returned. Another 25% have been displaced twice. A small fraction (3 or 4%) have been displaced 2 or 3 times.

Interviewees who are still displaced (so the IDPs) were asked what made them choose this specific neighbourhood. The number of respondents in 108, out of whom 88 leave in Al Salmani (by design). The top reason (graph below) is obviously a close social network and probably a short distance as people have either always lived in this neighbourhood or have their family, friends or tribe living here. –by design, mostly Al Salmani.

### Top 2 reasons for coming to the area

- We have always been living here
- More secure environment
- More opportunity for better services
- More economic opportunities here
- Friends, family or tribe lives here
- Dwelling provided by the public authorities
- Cheaper rent prices in chosen area
- Better opportunity to move to another place within Libya

- 72%
- 25%
- 3%
- 1%

**NUMBER OF DISPLACEMENTS (IDPS AND RETURNEES, 330 RESPONDENTS)**
Two thirds of the people who have returned to their homes in Benghazi have been displaced within Benghazi. 8% have been displaced to Al Marj and to Al Abyar, cities respectively 90 and 60 km away. The remaining 15% are quite well spread in various cities along the coast. Out of the IDP sample (mindful of the bias as the interviewees were mainly derived from Libaid lists), only one household did not originate from Cyrenaica. Out of the 107 remaining households, only two did not originate from Benghazi Mintaka. Of the 106 remaining, 20% are displaced from Akarbish and 20% from Sabri Echarqui, roughly 10% come from respectively Downtown, Sharif, West al Gharbi and Argbel. It may warrant exploring whether the area of origin may be even unintentionally a cause of not making it to the list of assistance.

Return intention:

About 90% of the interviewees (IDPs only) said they want to return to their home of origin, with limited variation according to the level of damage of their house of origin -self-assessed according to their perception of damage as the enumerators were visiting the current dwelling and not the dwelling of origin.

This is a more significant according to whether current IDPs own their home before displacement or they were renting it. Indeed, in the former case, 90% of the concerned people want to go back and 70% of the latter.

Interestingly, beyond the intention, the eventuality of return seems related to the house condition. Indeed, 97% of the returnees stated they fled their houses in 2011 because of the lack of security and the violence in the area they were living, only 2% reported their dwelling was damaged or destroyed. The figure is striking when it comes to the IDPs, where 44% and 39% of the respondents currently still displaced stated that they fled in 2011 because their houses were respectively damaged or destroyed. Another 14% left not because of the house damage but due to the lack of security—and half of them also have their houses damaged or destroyed.
VIII. Information and assistance

Assistance received

There is a bias here as the sampling relied on Libaid beneficiary list – therefore IDPs contacted are known by an organization that provides assistance. One must also bear in mind that this is a snapshot of the assistance received, that the analysis tried to see in conjunction with some objective and basic elements of vulnerability. It does not offer a correlation with the level of needs at household level.

Overall, slightly more than half of the displaced people have received assistance in the last 6 months, and about 10% of the returnees. The total number of respondents in this section is 74, being 50 IDPs, 21 returnees and 3 non-displaced. 49 are living in Al Salmani (location targeted for the IDPs sample), 21 in Benina and 3 in Al-Jadida.

Focusing on the people who have been displaced or returned in the last 6 months (as these factors are often used as a cut-off points to determine the eligible to assistance), data shows that 14% who received assistance in the last 6 months (that is two cases out of 14, one received food the other one non-food items). These two cases are IDPs. Out of the ones who reported not receiving assistance despite a displacement or return within the last 6 months, 8 are IDPs and 4 are returnees.

The 50 IDP households who reported receiving assistance have been living in their current dwelling usually for several years. None of the three cases of IDPs displaced for less than a month had received assistance.
In an attempt to make sense of what could be the driver to receive assistance, we ran simple comparative analysis on some key criteria such as gender of the head of household, age of the head of household, household size, level of damage of the house and presence of someone with a severe health condition in the household. Given the initial bias towards the representatives of the IDPs sample of this question (as they were mostly taken from the list of Libaid); we segregated the analysis for the IDPs on one side and for the Returnees/non-displaced on the other. It shows that:

- Women-headed household are more represented in the households receiving assistance than in the general population. Respectively 33% and 29% of IDPs or Returnees/non-displaced households receiving assistance are headed by women, while it about 25% in the overall sample.

- The household size does not seem to come into play when selecting IDPs for assistance. For the returnees/non-displaced, the average household size is 6.5 while it is six in the overall sample, tending to show that the households who receive assistance are larger than average families.

- The age of the head of household is similar for both categories to the average one in the sample.

- The presence of someone with a severe health condition seem to be a factor for assistance especially for the IDPs: IDPs households receiving assistance have an average of 0.92 person with a health conditions while the average is 0.75 in the overall IDPs sample. The difference is less telling for the returnees/non-displaced (0.79 vs 0.73). However, out of the three non-displaced households who receive assistance, two have several people with a serious health condition.

- The level of destruction of the dwelling currently inhabited does not seem to be a prime factor influencing the selection for assistance of the IDPs. It seems different in the case of returnees/non-displaced as 50% of the household selected for assistance have a damaged dwelling –while this proportion is a third in the total sample. It could be that the quality of the shelter or damage suffered is used as a proxy by organizations providing assistance (be they charities, Municipalities, etc.) or that it is the embodiment of a series of other economic vulnerability.

### Information

60% of the sample reported that they did not receive any information about assistance or access to basic services. This increased to 66% when the IDP sample is taken out, noting that most of them are part of Libaid lists.
40% of the people would like to have information on assistance, or 34% on how to access basic services. It seems therefore that there is a gap in information provision. Other requests for more information were related to demining and reconstruction. Particularly respondents from Qnfodah requested information on demining (40% of them) and to a lesser extent respondents from Garyounes and Benina (20% of them, especially those who have heard of a mine incident recently).

About half of all respondents were interested to have information about reconstruction. This comes to 80% for the IDPs.

People stated that they prefer to receive information by television, SMS, social media and radio to a lesser extent. This is common across categories of respondents.