


Social Protection

Spending in Lebanon



An Examination of State Financing of Social Protection
Budget Review Policy Brief

In partnership with:  **unicef**
for every child



Please cite this publication as:

Institut des Finance Basil Fuleihan (2021), " Social Protection Spending in Lebanon: An Examination of State Financing of Social Protection", URL: <http://institutdesfinances.gov.lb/publication/social-protection-spending-in-lebanon-a-dive-into-the-state-financing-of-social-protection/>

ISBN 978-9953-9037-0-5

This brief was prepared in collaboration with Financially Wise and published in partnership with UNICEF and the International Labor Organization, under the project "*Enhancing Budget Transparency, Accountability and Inclusiveness in Lebanon*".



Table of content

I- Background & Methodology

Context – **Lebanon's free fall into poverty**

Context – Fiscal Outlook and exit scenario

Purpose – Drive evidence-based policy decisions

Scope – Analyzing the Government financing of social spending through its budget

Methodology – Data sources

Methodology – Definitions of social protection programs and services

Methodology – Assumptions

Methodology – Limitations

Methodology – Approach

II – Findings of the Budget Review

Macro-fiscal analysis - Social Protection spending as per the Functional Classification of Budget

Expanding the analysis beyond the functional classification

Macro-fiscal analysis - Social Protection spending as per a wider definition

Analysis of Social Protection spending by contingency

Analysis of Social Protection spending by beneficiary group

Public sector

Private sector

Poor and vulnerable groups

All sectors

Other

Table of content

By pillar - main findings of Social Protection spending

Pillar 1 – Employment related social protection including Social Insurance

Pillar 2 – Social Assistance

Pillar 3 – Financial Access to services

Pillar 4– Social Welfare

Pillar 5– Economic inclusion and labor activation

Analysis of Social Protection spending by Implementing agency

Analysis of Social Protection spending by Source of Financing

III- Summary findings

IV- Conclusions & Recommendations

V- Appendixes

List of Figures

- Figure 1: Total budgeted expenses covering Social Protection (function 10)
- Figure 2: Function 10-Social protection as share of current GDP
- Figure 3: Public social protection expenditures, excluding health, selected regions (% of GDP) (UNICEF, 2019)
- Figure 4: Share of social protection expenditure (in % of GDP) in selected countries (2018)
- Figure 5: Coverage of the poorest and richest quintiles by social safety nets, by country (in %) (World Bank, 2018)
- Figure 6: Poverty and extreme Poverty Rates for the Lebanese population, 2012-2020 (World Bank, 2020)
- Figure 7: Social protection coverage by decile, Lebanese citizens (ILO, 2021)
- Figure 8: Distribution of beneficiaries and benefits (Lebanese citizens only), by income decile (ILO, 2021)
- Figure 9: Share of informal sector in Lebanon (2009, 2010 – 2019, 2020)
- Figure 10: Functional classification – distribution of main functions under social protection
- Figure 11: Functional classification – major secondary functions
- Figure 12: Proportion of Lebanese citizens receiving SP benefits, by selected individual characteristics (ILO, 2021)
- Figure 13: Social protection spending classified outside function 10
- Figure 14: Evolution of budgeted SP expenses per functions (functions as share of total SP)
- Figure 15: Reclassification of social protection spending identified under and outside Function 10 into the five pillars
- Figure 16: Effective SP spending as share of current GDP
- Figure 17: Evolution of budgeted SP expenses as share of total budgeted expenses incl. annexed budgets* (thousands of LBP)

List of Figures

Figure 18: Cumulative SP spending by social risk between 2017-2019 (thousands of LBP) - excluding NSSF budget

Figure 19: SP spending on old ages (thousands of LBP) - including NSSF budget

Figure 20: SP spending on old ages per beneficiary group

Figure 21: SP spending on Wellbeing (thousands of LBP)

Figure 22: SP spending on Wellbeing per beneficiary group

Figure 23: SP spending on Medical care (thousands of LBP)

Figure 24: SP spending on Medical care per beneficiary group

Figure 25: Spending gap by beneficiary groups (thousands of LBP) – 2017-2019)

Figure 26: SP spending by beneficiary group (thousands of LBP)

Figure 27: SP spending by beneficiary group – all public sector groups (thousands of LBP)

Figure 28: SP spending by beneficiary group – Public sector civil servants and military personnel (thousands of LBP))

Figure 29: Evolution of spending on pensions and end of service indemnities (thousands of LBP)

Figure 30: SP spending by beneficiary group – military personnel (thousands of LBP)

Figure 31: Other social benefits to security forces (thousands of LBP)

Figure 32: SP spending by beneficiary group – civil servants (thousands of LBP)

Figure 33: **Government contribution to civil servants' cooperative (thousands of LBP)**

Figure 34: Government contribution to other mutual funds (Effective spending - thousands of LBP)

List of Figures

- Figure 35: SP spending by beneficiary group – private sector workers (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 36: Government contributions to other entities (Effective spending - thousands of LBP)
- Figure 37: SP spending by beneficiary group – poor and vulnerable categories (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 38: SP spending by beneficiary group – all sectors (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 39: SP spending by beneficiary group – other (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 40: Evolution of main pillars by budgeted appropriations (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 41: Evolution of disaggregated pillars by effective appropriations (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 42: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Insurance (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 43: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Assistance (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 44: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Financial Access to Services (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 45: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Welfare (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 46: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars (thousands of LBP)
- Figure 47: SP breakdown by implementing agency – Average share of 2017,2018,2019
- Figure 48: Appropriation share by line ministries – Average share of effective spending over 4 years
- Figure 49: Effective Social Protection spending by source of financing (percentage share)
- Figure 50: Evolution of SP total expenses in thousands of LBP
- Figure 51: Evolution of SP total expenses excluding Transfers to EDL (thousands of LBP)

List of Tables

- Table 1: GFSM 2001 – Classification of Expense by Function of Government
- Table 2: Table 2: Social Protection n.e.c. breakdown by line-item, Lebanon, 2019
- Table 3: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)
- Table 4: Spending on drugs by Government agency
- Table 5: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs excl. pensions – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP) – Public Sector
- Table 6: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP) – Private Sector
- Table 7: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP) – Poor and vulnerable groups
- Table 8: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP) – All sectors
- Table 9: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP) – Other
- Table 10: Social welfare spending gap by implementing agency - 2019 - (thousands of LBP)
- Table 11: Economic inclusion and labor activation breakdown by program (thousands of LBP)
- Table 12: Contribution schemes - (thousands of LBP)
- Table 13: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

List of acronyms

BDL	Banque du Liban (Central Bank)
BRD	Beyond and Development Group
EDL	Electricité du Liban
GFSM	Government Finance Statistics Manual of the International Monetary Fund
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LBP	Lebanese Pound
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoPH	Ministry of Public Health
MOSA	Ministry of Social Affairs
NSSF	National Social Security Fund
SDC	Social Development Center
SP	Social Protection
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
WB	World Bank

Acknowledgement

The policy brief was prepared by a team from the [Institut des Finances Basil Fuleihan](#) composed of Sabine Hatem (Senior Economist), Iskandar Boustany (Consultant and Budget Specialist, President of Financially Wise) and Abdo Daou (Consultant and Budget Analyst), under the supervision of Lamia Moubayed Bissat (President). Visuals were designed by Ms. Tonia Salameh.

The team conducted a third-party budget review on social protection financed by the Government of Lebanon through the State Budget. It analyzed spending composition, trends, and main sources of financing. The review was conducted between July and December 2020.

The team is thankful for the continuous support and valuable advice and reviews provided by Gilbert Doumit and Lara Feghali (from [Beyond and Development Group](#)), Luca Pellerano, Rania Eghnatios and Nienke Raap (from the [International Labor Organization](#)) and Sarah Hague, Yasmine Ibrahim, Walid Sayegh, and Kawthar Dara (from [UNICEF](#)).

The Institute of Finance is also appreciative of the collaboration of the [Ministry of Finance](#) of Lebanon that provided access to data on budgeted and effective spending on social protection, as well as to the [National Social Security Fund](#), without which the report would not have been possible.

This work was financed under the project *"Enhancing Budget Transparency, Accountability and Inclusiveness in Lebanon"*, implemented by the [Institut des Finances Basil Fuleihan](#), in partnership with [UNICEF](#).

1

Background and Methodology

Context: Lebanon's free-fall into poverty

Rapidly and continuously deteriorating macroeconomic conditions, coupled to the COVID-19 pandemic and political crisis, are pushing the Lebanese population into dire poverty. The magnitude of these multiple crises requires from the country to quickly bolster its social protection coping mechanisms to safeguard growing vulnerable groups and avoid a potentially disastrous impact on the nation's well-being.

The year 2020 has been particularly challenging for Lebanon. The country witnessed the collapse of its economy as well as of its financial sector. This was marked by the country's debt default in March 2020, the rapid depreciation of its national currency, the collapse of its fixed peg exchange-rate mechanism, an economic contraction of 24% (IMF) and third-digit inflation with a 120% CPI increase between August 2019 and August 2020 (Central Administration of Statistics), to which are added the repercussions of the global COVID-19 pandemic and related containment measures. Further to this, the 4th of August Port Explosion that left more than 200 casualties, 6,000 injured, and 300,000 homeless, has massively damaged Beirut's key trade and shipping hub as well as its neighboring residential, industrial, and business areas, thereby requiring substantial resources for reconstruction and humanitarian assistance.

These compounded crises have destroyed the livelihood of thousands of people who continue to suffer from electricity and water supply shortages, a waste management crisis, worsening social conditions and weak public finance management. As a consequence, more than 55% of the Lebanese population had fallen into poverty in 2020 (ESCWA, 2020), a number that is expected to further increase as a result of rising inflation and the absence of a proper policy response. This brought the total number of poor among the Lebanese population to 1.1 million and 2.7 million for the lower and the upper poverty lines respectively. It represented an increase of 1.3 million poor from the pre-COVID-19 and pre-explosion growth scenario for 2020 (ESCWA, 2020). In addition, Lebanon remains the host to the largest refugee per capita population in the world, who are also very badly hit by the crisis: by the end of 2020, poverty was expected to have increased by 56 p.p. among the Syrian refugees around the international poverty line and by 42 p.p. around the national poverty line, with assistance programs not being able to mitigate more than 3 p.p. of this increase (equivalent to 8%)(WB and UNHCR, 2020).

Context: Fiscal outlook and exit scenarios

Lebanon's compounded crisis requires a faster, more inclusive policy response that includes an upscaling of targeted social protection frameworks and programs, providing the conditions for a crisis exit scenario and countering for the looming loss of human development gains achieved in the past decades.

The dire situation calls for a fast and inclusive policy response, notably in terms of social protection, to mitigate the loss of livelihood and growing risk of impoverishment. To this end, the Lebanese Government had engaged in talks with the IMF for a support program that would entail strict fiscal adjustment and austerity measures, a fair distribution of losses, economic stimulus packages and targeted social protection programs.

In its "Financial Recovery Plan" (April 2020), it had foreseen the expansion of social safety nets through yearly budget allocations amounting respectively to USD 1bn in 2020, USD 1.5bn in 2021, USD 1.3bn in 2022, USD 1bn in 2023 and USD 0.75bn in 2024. In its 2021 Budget Proposal, the Ministry of Finance has allocated LBP 150 billion to support the most vulnerable households. The WB also approved, in January 2021, a loan of USD 246 million destined to finance emergency cash transfers and access to social services to approximately 786,000 poor and vulnerable Lebanese reeling under the pressure of Lebanon's economic and COVID-19 crises and support the development of a comprehensive national social safety net system.

Amid marginal fiscal space, and with a fiscal deficit of more than USD 3 billion, a balance of payment crisis and the depletion of its FX reserves, the only way forward for Lebanon inevitably passes through a reallocation and reprioritization of existing social spending. This needs to start with an assessment of the financing, distribution and impact of current spending and would be later complemented by a prioritization exercise, informed by social indicators and a clear vision of the way forward.

Purpose: Drive evidence-based policy decisions

The Budget Spending Review is an evidence-based exercise that aims to inform policymaking by providing insights on the financing of social spending by the Government of Lebanon and recommendations to enhance its potential reallocation, targeting and performance.

The present Budget Spending Review was conducted by the Institut des Finances Basil Fuleihan, in the context of the National Social Protection Strategy being developed by UNICEF, the ILO and Beyond Group, upon the request of the Ministry of Social Affairs.

It aims to:

1. Provide an, which could serve as a basis for fiscal space analysis.
2. Provide evidence overview and analysis of the level of financing available through the Government Budget for social protection programmes at a disaggregated level and input for the costing of the New Social Protection Strategy.
3. Inform research work and policy-making on social protection that might affect the livelihoods of millions of people.

What is a Budget Spending Review?

The Budget Spending Review is a coordinated and in-depth analysis of baseline expenditures that helps:

1. Detect efficiency savings and opportunities for fiscal consolidation and value-for-money.
2. Streamline the reallocation of public expenditure or even the free-up of fiscal space.

It is an instrument of structural and selective expenditure-based consolidation and does not intend to assess the entire social protection system.

Scope: Analyze Government financing of social spending through its Budget

The Budget Spending Review covered all allocations made under the State Budget to finance social protection services and programs, adopting a wide and comprehensive perspective for data collection and analysis that went beyond the traditional budget classification.

In the present case, the Budget Spending Review focused solely on the government financing of social protection services in Lebanon through the State Budget. Direct financing from international organizations, NGOs, and other sources of financing were not included in the data collection and analysis.

The Budget Review tried to overcome existing budget classifications (administrative, functional and economic) to further reflect on how social protection policy is structured and funded. It mapped every line of spending dedicated to social protection with the aim of collecting evidence on the level of financing, of increasing the value delivered for each LBP spent, of informing adjustment or redesign strategies of the existing social protection framework in order to better target social benefits, of addressing Lebanon's socio-economic and fiscal realities, and of feeding in the costing of the new strategy.

Despite existing data gaps and limitations (that are detailed further ahead), findings provide a good indication on the main categories and trends of social protection spending, and evidence to draw policy recommendations at the policy, program and operational levels.

Methodology – Data sources

Budget data on social protection is fragmented, dispersed, and incomplete. In the absence of audited and publicly available government accounts, and in light of the lack of data, alternative approaches were combined. Data collection mostly relied on budgeted and spending data provided by the Ministry of Finance and partially by the NSSF. Some data gaps remained unfilled as no integrated financial system allows for easy data collection and aggregation.

The Budget Spending Review mapped social spending made from budget allocations over the period between 2017 and 2020.

- Planned spending was extracted from the State budget laws of 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.
- Unaudited spending data for the years 2017-2019 was provided jointly by the Ministry of Finance's Macroeconomic Analysis and Studies department at the Budget Directorate, the Directorate of Public Accounting and the Directorate of Disbursement. This approach allowed to mitigate the absence of publicly available data on spending, as the latter is still pending the audit and approval of the Court of Accounts and Parliament.
- The NSSF provided its spending data for the period 2017-2019 but no access was granted to its budgeted data. Further details on how NSSF allocations were accounted for are provided later in this brief.
- As the study was conducted in 2020, no spending data was available for 2020.
- To allow for future comparisons and trends, annexed budgets were included in the dataset since they became an integral part of the budget as of 2021.

The full data set is available in Appendix 1.

Methodology – Definitions social protection programs and services

For ease of reference and relevance, the classification of social protection pillars adopted under this Review was the same as the one retained for the National Social Protection Strategy and presented in the position paper on “Social Protection in Lebanon: Bridging the immediate response with long-term priorities” prepared by the UNICEF and ILO under the UN Joint Program on Social Protection and Beyond Group.

- Social assistance is defined as non-contributory social protection which consists of cash and in-kind transfers, and subsidies.
- Employment related social protection including Social insurance relates to contributory social protection, funded by contributions paid by (or on behalf of) beneficiaries or taxpayers. As with other insurance mechanisms, the purpose of social insurance is to mitigate the impact of risks associated with unemployment, disability, sickness and old age.
- Financial access to social services is concerned with addressing cost barriers to the receipt of care, including user fees, out-of-pocket (OOP) payments, or other associated costs (e.g., financial access to healthcare and fees waivers, health insurance, financial access to education, etc.).
- Economic inclusion and labor activation encompasses labor regulations which aim to protect employees’ rights to decent work, and active labor market policies which aim to promote labor-market entry and access to better employment, assist reemployment by improving job readiness, and improve matching of supply and demand in the labor market.
- Social welfare defines a non-contributory social protection which includes service interventions as well as the various outreach, case management and referral services that can support the complex needs of families. It also includes the development and support of a social workforce.

A list of programs included under each Pillar is provided in Appendix 2.

Methodology – Assumptions

The below assumptions were made to facilitate the review and analysis:

- Assumption 1: Government transfers to NSSF as an employer are accounted for under “Contributions”, i.e., as a source of financing and not as a Social Protection expenditure.

Government contributions to the NSSF were accounted as social contributions (as opposed to expenditure) paid by the State as an employer to finance End-of-service indemnities, family allowances and sickness and maternity care. To avoid double counting, these line items were removed from social protection benefits.

- Assumption 2: Budget allocations to the Civil Servants Cooperative and Mutual Funds are entirely accounted for as social protection expenditures.

Since it was only possible to record allocations transferred by the government to the Civil Servants Cooperative and Mutual Funds and not the benefits these institutions/funds pay to their constituents, available data was entirely accounted for as social protection expenditures.

- Assumption 3: Only fiscal subsidies were accounted for and analyzed in the scope of the budget review.

The Central Bank of Lebanon finances, from FX reserves, subsidies for imports of essential goods including energy, wheat, medicine and food. However, in the scope of this study, only fiscal subsidies, financed from the State budget, were accounted for and analyzed.

Methodology – Limitations

The complexity of the review and limitations stemmed from structural deficiencies in the budget, and in particular from the absence of programmatic information on specific sectoral spending and the unsystematic classification of expenditures.

The Lebanese budget is a line-budget item that does not provide programmatic information on specific sectoral spending.

As well, the budget is not comprehensive and does not provide holistic access to all social protection spending data. Reporting on spending of several public institutions such as the NSSF does not follow the regular budget process and only net accounts are included in the state budget.

The budget classification is not systematic and many social protection expenditures are captured under hybrid line-items such as “transfers”. In addition, some detailed data is not classified and can only be found in the explanations provided under the lowest level of economic classification, unclassified.

It is also important to note that the review could not look into the internal budgets of specific spending entities such as the Cooperative of Civil Servants and the various security forces.

Therefore, some data gaps remained unfilled: For instance, NSSF budgeted data was not accessible and only a partial targeting of all social protection programs financed through direct budget support by donors could be established.

Finally, the Budget Spending Review only covered the period 2017-2020, as prior to that, and for 10 years (2006-2016), Lebanon did not ratify any budget law.



Methodology – Approach

The brief starts by analyzing spending on Social Protection in Lebanon according to the Social Protection Function, as recorded under the international standard classification provided by the International Monetary Fund in its Government Finance Statistics Manual (GFSM 2001) to account for spending on social protection and detailed in the following section.

However, a more in-depth analysis of collected data, guided by the definitions adopted for social protection programs and services in the newly proposed National Social Protection Strategy revealed that a considerable share of social protection is accounted for outside of the Social Protection Function.

Thus, in the second part of the analysis, the budget review goes beyond the “traditional” classification and maps all budget lines that finance social spending, notably every spending line which purpose is either social assistance, social insurance, financial access to services, economic inclusion and labor activation or social welfare, and provides a more comprehensive evaluation of the weight of Government financing of social protection.

An analysis is proposed in terms of spending by (1) Contingency, (2) Beneficiary Group, (3) Pillar, (4) Implementing Agency and (5) Source of financing.

Main findings are presented and discussed and inform the recommendations proposed in the last section to enhance the financing and fiscal aspects of social protection.

What is the functional classification of budget?

Budget classifications are essential for users to understand how the budget is structured and spent and for which purpose. The IMF's Government Finance Statistics Manual (GFSM 2001) provides a standard framework for budget classification adopted in most countries around the world. Through its functional classification, it organizes government activities according to their broad objectives or purposes. (e.g., education, social security, housing, etc.).

Budget classification is a normative framework that determines the way the budget is recorded, presented and reported.

According to the IMF, a sound budget classification includes at least a classification of revenues as well as an administrative, economic, and functional classifications of expenditures:

1. The administrative classification identifies the entity that is responsible for managing concerned public funds, such as the ministry of social affairs or health or labor or affiliated public institutions such as the National Social Security Fund.
2. The economic classification identifies the type of expenditure incurred, for example, salaries, goods and services, transfers and interest payments, or capital spending.
3. The functional classification categorizes expenditures according to the purposes and objectives for which they are intended. It is independent of the government's administrative or organizational structure.

The functional classification was used in the first part of the review to map spending on social protection in Lebanon.

Social Protection is a key function of Government spending and provides a straightforward estimation of social spending.

The first part of the analysis takes an in-depth look at the functional classification of the budget for social protection spending. This classification is especially useful in analyzing the allocation of resources among sectors and is used to produce historical trends.

The IMF GFSM-2001 identifies 8 main functions of Government spending among which Social Protection (referred to as Function 10). Within the social protection sector, we find 9 secondary functions:

- Sickness and disability
- Old age
- Survivors
- Family and children
- Unemployment
- Housing
- Social exclusion not elsewhere classified (n.e.c.)
- R&D Social protection
- Social Protection n.e.c. (detailed in the next page).

The main and secondary functions are pre-defined internationally for purposes of comparison.

Table 1: GFSM 2001 – Classification of Expense by Function of Government

Total outlays	
701 General public services	706 Housing and community amenities
7011 Executive and legislative organs, financial and fiscal affairs, external affairs	7061 Housing development
7012 Foreign economic aid	7062 Community development
7013 General services	7063 Water supply
7014 Basic research	7064 Street lighting
7015 R&D ¹ General public services	7065 R&D Housing and community amenities
7016 General public services n.e.c. ²	7066 Housing and community amenities n.e.c.
7017 Public debt transactions	707 Health
7018 Transfers of a general character between different levels of government	7071 Medical products, appliances, and equipment
702 Defense	7072 Outpatient services
7021 Military defense	7073 Hospital services
7022 Civil defense	7074 Public health services
7023 Foreign military aid	7075 R&D Health
7024 R&D Defense	7076 Health n.e.c.
7025 Defense n.e.c.	708 Recreation, culture, and religion
703 Public order and safety	7081 Recreational and sporting services
7031 Police services	7082 Cultural services
7032 Fire protection services	7083 Broadcasting and publishing services
7033 Law courts	7084 Religious and other community services
7034 Prisons	7085 R&D Recreation, culture, and religion
7035 R&D Public order and safety	7086 Recreation, culture, and religion n.e.c.
7036 Public order and safety n.e.c.	709 Education
704 Economic affairs	7091 Pre-primary and primary education
7041 General economic, commercial, and labor affairs	7092 Secondary education
7042 Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting	7093 Postsecondary nontertiary education
7043 Fuel and energy	7094 Tertiary education
7044 Mining, manufacturing, and construction	7095 Education not definable by level
7045 Transport	7096 Subsidiary services to education
7046 Communication	7097 R&D Education
7047 Other industries	7098 Education n.e.c.
7048 R&D Economic affairs	710 Social protection
7049 Economic affairs n.e.c.	7101 Sickness and disability
705 Environmental protection	7102 Old age
7051 Waste management	7103 Survivors
7052 Waste water management	7104 Family and children
7053 Pollution abatement	7105 Unemployment
7054 Protection of biodiversity and landscape	7106 Housing
7055 R&D Environmental protection	7107 Social exclusion n.e.c.
7056 Environmental protection n.e.c.	7108 R&D Social protection
	7109 Social protection n.e.c.

¹ R&D – Research and development.

² n.e.c. – not elsewhere classified.

³ GFSM 2001 incorporates the Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) of the OECD and the IUT

What falls under Social Protection n.e.c.?

SP n.e.c. includes interalia:

- Complementary allowances for security forces.
- Government contributions to non-government organizations.
- Government contributions to security and mutual funds.
- Other government programs.

Table 2: Social Protection n.e.c. breakdown by line-item, Lebanon, 2019

SP n.e.c. 2019 / billions of LBP	
Allowances for social expenditures for security forces	Government contributions to the Parliament employees' mutual funds
Caritas	Government contributions to the Shariah court judges' mutual funds
Contribution to associations dealing with delinquent minors	Government contributions to the teacher's funds
Contribution to Caritas	Imam Sadr Foundation
Contribution to fund the deficit of the General directorate of Cereals And Sugar beets	National program to support landmines and Cluster Munitions Casualties
Development programs	National support program for mine casualties
Foyer De L'amitié - Zahleh	Red in Circle Association
Government contributions to other mutual funds	School allowances for security forces
Government contributions to the civil servant's cooperative	Sickness and maternity pay for security forces
Government contributions to the judge's mutual funds	Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs
Government contributions to the Lebanese University teachers' mutual funds	Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs + Development programs
Government contributions to the legal assistants' mutual funds	Social Development centers
Government contributions to the MPs mutual funds	Social welfare programs

2

Findings of the Budget Review

Macro-fiscal analysis of Social Protection spending as per the Functional Classification of Budget

HIGHLIGHTS:

Lebanon spent, between 2017 and 2020, 5 to 6% of its GDP and 22% of its budget on Social Protection.


However, coverage remains far from being inclusive. The largest share goes to “Spending on Old Age” and finances, in particular, Retirement and End-of-Service Indemnities.

Over 2017-2020, Lebanon spent on average 22% of its budget on social protection, according to the functional classification of budget.

Social protection as share of total budget grew by 10 p.p. between 2017 and 2020, mostly driven by two factors:

- (1)- an increase in Pensions and End-of-Service expenditures, resulting from the new public sector salary scale law ratified in 2017.
- (2)- Lebanon's sovereign debt default (in March 2020) and resulting decrease in spending on debt interests that has inflated the share of other functions, notably social protection, in the 2020 Budget.

Figure 1: Total budgeted expenses covering Social Protection (function 10)



The 2020 budget law witnessed a substantial cut on domestic interests, thus reducing overall budgeted expenses. The spending on the social protection function however, reached around 4.9 trillion LBP, leading to 5 p.p. over year increase in relative share.

It spent in the past 4 years the equivalent of 5 to 6% of its GDP on social protection

With the on-going crisis, it is important to note that despite the increase in the share of social protection in the 2020 budget, the share of social protection in the current GDP dropped, eaten up by inflation. This can be explained by the current GDP 's elasticity to prices compared to fiscal rigidity in spending.

It is important to note that Lebanon's reporting includes partial reporting on medical care (i.e., health) under the Social Protection Function, unlike other countries. However, for the year 2019, if we exclude the share of spending on medical care recorded under the "Social Protection" Function (eq. to 1.37% of GDP), overall spending on social protection excluding health drops to 4.08% of GDP but remains higher than the average in Arab States.

Figure 2: Function 10-Social protection as share of current GDP





Figure 3: Public social protection expenditures, excluding health, selected regions (% of GDP) (2015)




Reference 11

Benchmarking Lebanon social protection spending with other lower-middle income countries and the Arab region


Lebanon spends relatively more on social protection than its Arab neighbors. However, it stands below the global spending of other lower middle-income countries. Moreover, Lebanon’s social safety net is regressive and benefits the wealthy better than the poor, unlike most of its Arab neighbors.

Figure 4: Share of social protection expenditure (in % of GDP) in selected countries (2018)



Reference 11

Figure 5: Coverage of the poorest and richest quintiles by social safety nets, by country (in %) (World Bank, 2018)




Reference 17

In Lebanon, growth in social protection spending has not translated into poverty alleviation...

Though the poverty increase in Lebanon is a direct result of economic recession coupled with a series of external shocks (impact of the Syrian crisis, LBP depreciation, COVID-19 pandemic), spending on Social Protection was not able to protect the most vulnerable or to mitigate the increase in poverty rates, notably of extreme poverty.

Figure 6: Poverty and extreme Poverty Rates for the Lebanese population, 2012-2020* (World Bank, 2020)




*Poverty rates are all projected, as the latest survey conducted to measure poverty in Lebanon dates back to 2012.

And coverage is still far from being fair and inclusive.

About a quarter of Lebanese citizens have no access to social protection. This limited coverage is resulting in an unequal and highly regressive social protection system, that is skewed towards formal and public sector workers and high-income households. The predominance of contributory schemes means that poor and vulnerable groups are at high risk of remaining uncovered.


Figure 7: Social protection coverage by decile, Lebanese citizens (ILO, 2021)



Reference 7

© Institut des Finances Basil Fuleihan 2021

Figure 8: Distribution of beneficiaries and benefits (Lebanese citizens only), by income decile (ILO, 2021)




Reference 7

More than 55% of the labor force works in the informal sector and does not benefit from any formal social protection scheme. This share is expected to reach 71% in 2020.

The share of informal employment has grown steadily over the last decade. This trend may have two implications for the design of future social protection schemes. The first is that employment programs should try to incentivize the transfer of employees from the informal to the formal sector. The other would be to foresee an expansion of the share of social insurance as coverage might need to further expand.

Figure 9: Share of informal sector in Lebanon (2009, 2010 – 2019,2020)




References 6, 9, 10 and 12

“Spending on old age” in amount and share remains consistently the highest category of spending

Diving further into the expenditures, “spending on old age” in amount and share remains consistently the highest category of spending, driven by the share of retirement and end-of-service indemnities that eat up more than half of spending.

Figure 10: Functional classification – distribution of main functions under social protection



And Lebanon's State protection system caters for the lucky few.

This scheme provides the elderly with protection and allocates up to 59% of spending on social protection to retirement and end-of-service indemnities. However, the system is highly skewed towards public sector workers.

Figure 11: Functional classification – major secondary functions





Figure 12: Proportion of Lebanese citizens receiving SP benefits, by selected individual characteristics (ILO, 2021)



Reference 7

Expanding the analysis beyond the functional classification

HIGHLIGHTS:

More than 40% of spending on social protection is classified outside of the traditional functional classification adopted by country to report on their expenditures in a harmonized manner.

Expanding the base for analysis.

A significant amount of spending is not categorized under the "social protection" functional classification but could be captured in the scope of this study as social spending.

A more thorough inspection of the budget revealed that a considerable share of social protection is accounted for outside of Function 10 – Social Protection.


Thus, the budget review went beyond the "traditional" classification and mapped all budget lines that financed any kind of social spending, notably every spending line which purpose was either social assistance, social insurance, financial access to services, economic inclusion and labor activation or social welfare.

The following analysis of key findings is based on this wide mapping and data collection that provides a more comprehensive outlook and approach to Government's social spending in Lebanon.

More than 40% of social protection spending is classified outside of the Social Protection Function (Function 10)

The drop to 34.5% in 2020 needs to be analyzed in relative terms. The economic contraction and shrinking fiscal space have added pressure on the budget and constrained the Government to prioritize compulsory spending such as pensions. Given their weight in the Social Protection function, that share relatively grew against the share of Social Protection spending found elsewhere in the budget.


Figure 13: Social protection spending classified outside function 10



Where can we identify other spending on social protection in the budget?

55-65% of SP expenses are classified under the Social Protection function, while 27% can be found under the Economic affairs function (composed mainly of transfers to EDL) and about 8% under the health function.

Figure 14: Evolution of budgeted SP expenses per functions (functions as share of total SP)



*Prior to 2018, transfers to EDL were classified under economic affairs. As of 2018, they were accounted for as a treasury advance, but for consistency, we have integrated them under economic affairs for 2018-2020.

Overall Social Protection spending was re-classified under the 5 Strategy pillars

Figure 15: Reclassification of social protection spending identified under and outside Function 10 into the five pillars

SP spending classified under Function 10 (Social Protection)			SP spending classified outside Function 10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allowances for social expenditures for security forces ▪ Birth allowances for security forces ▪ Contribution to veterans ▪ Death allowances for security forces ▪ End of service indemnities ▪ Family allowances ▪ Government Contribution/End of service indemnities ▪ Government Contribution/End of service indemnities - settlements ▪ Government Contribution/End-of-service indemnities ▪ Government Contribution/Family allowances ▪ Government Contribution/Family allowances - drivers ▪ Government Contribution/Mayors ▪ Government Contribution/Sickness - taxi drivers ▪ Government Contribution/Sickness and maternity care ▪ Government Contribution/Voluntary program ▪ Government contributions to other mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the civil servants cooperative ▪ Government contributions to the judges mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the Lebanese University teachers mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the legal assistants mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the MPs mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the Parliament employees mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the Shariah court judges mutual funds ▪ Government contributions to the teachers funds ▪ Hospitalization expenses for security forces ▪ Marriage allowances for security forces ▪ Other medical expenses for security forces ▪ Payment due to NSSF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pensions ▪ Retired public servants ▪ School allowances for security forces ▪ Sickness and maternity pay for security forces ▪ Transfers to cover the voluntary program deficit ▪ Contribution to fund the deficit of the General directorate of Cereals And Sugar beets ▪ Medrar Foundation ▪ Mouvement Social ▪ National Poverty Targeting Program (NPTP) ▪ National program for local socio-economic development ▪ Nutrition project ▪ Population and development program ▪ Population and Social Development program ▪ Rights and Access Program ▪ Shahid Foundation ▪ Subsidies for housing loans ▪ Medication - Ministry of Social Affairs ▪ Medicines committee ▪ Multiple Sclerosis Center - AUB ▪ Red in Circle Association ▪ Thalassemia ▪ Yaduna - Women heart health center ▪ Association for the disabled persons - Beyt Chabab ▪ Caritas ▪ Contribution to associations dealing with delinquent minors ▪ Contribution to Caritas ▪ Contribution to private entities ▪ Druze health establishment - nursing home ▪ Foyer De L'amitié - Zahleh ▪ Higher Council for Childhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imam Sadr Foundation ▪ Islamic orphanage ▪ JAD Foundation ▪ Lebanese Child Care Association ▪ Lebanese Council of Women ▪ Lebanese Welfare Association for the Handicapped ▪ Model center for the disabled ▪ National Commission For Lebanese Women ▪ National program to support landmines and Cluster Munitions Casualties ▪ National support program for mine casualties ▪ Preventing delinquency programs and special care ▪ Protecting juveniles at risk programs ▪ Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs ▪ Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs + Development programs ▪ Social Development centers ▪ Social welfare programs ▪ Support for families ▪ The National Program for combating begging ▪ The National Program for Drug Prevention ▪ Young Men's Christian Association, chronic disease medication ▪ Development programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribution to the syndicate of press photographers ▪ Effective allocations paid - Sickness and maternity care ▪ Effective allocations paid -family allowances ▪ Effective allocations paid - End of service indemnities ▪ General Union, Mutual funds, cooperatives and syndicates of agriculture ▪ Hospital expenses for security forces ▪ Medication for Army ▪ Medication for customs ▪ Medication for General Security Forces ▪ Medication for Internal Security Forces ▪ Medication for State Security Forces ▪ Sickness and maternity care ▪ Syndicate of private schools teachers ▪ Teachers association for primary education ▪ Teachers association for secondary education ▪ Veterinary Association in Lebanon ▪ Bread subsidies ▪ Fuel subsidies ▪ Purchase of wheat and barley ▪ School books subsidies ▪ School meals program ▪ Support for forage growers ▪ Support fund - amended rent act ▪ Transfers to EDL ▪ Bone Marrow Transplant Center / Makassed Hospital ▪ Children's Cancer Center of Lebanon ▪ Contribution to eye bank ▪ Contribution to the national organization for Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation ▪ Contributions to private-free schools/primary education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contributions to public hospitals ▪ Enrollment Fee Waivers ▪ Enrollment Fee Waivers + School books subsidies ▪ Epidemiological Surveillance Program ▪ Hospitalization expenses ▪ Joint Programs with UNICEF for basic medication and vaccines ▪ Joint Programs with WHO for primary health care ▪ Lebanese red cross inc blood bank ▪ Medication ▪ Primary Health Care Program ▪ Reproductive Health project ▪ Scholarships ▪ Transportation ▪ Vaccination program ▪ Vaccines program ▪ Caritas Lebanon ▪ Cedars Medical Association ▪ National program for adult learning ▪ National Rehabilitation and Development Center ▪ Oum El Nour ▪ Assistance to workers ▪ Contribution to the association of Arab press correspondents ▪ Contribution to the national program for nursing ▪ National center for vocational training ▪ National education scouts ▪ National employment office ▪ National scouts coordinators ▪ Subsidies for investment loans (agriculture, industry, tourism, technology)

Pillar I - Social insurance

Pillar II - Social Assistance

Pillar III - Financial access to services

Pillar IV - Social Welfare

Pillar V - Economic inclusion and labor activation


Macro-fiscal analysis- Social Protection spending as per a wider definition

HIGHLIGHTS:

Lebanon's spending on social protection between 2017 and 2020 reaches 13,86% of GDP and 30% of public expenditures when we expand the scope of analysis.


Social Protection spending as share of GDP doubles when we expand the analysis, reaching 13.86% of GDP in 2019 compared to 6.45%.

Figure 16: Effective SP spending as share of current GDP



With the wider definition, social protection spending reaches on average 30% of expenditures v/s 22% under the functional classification, over the same period of time.

Figure 17: Evolution of budgeted SP expenses as share of total budgeted expenses incl. annexed budgets* (thousands of LBP)



*Annexed budgets were designed to take into account the special conditions applying to some public institutions of a commercial nature, that enjoy financial autonomy but that were not granted an autonomous status. They were presented separately in Budget proposals and laws. Since they were merged within the budget as of 2021, they were integrated in our dataset and analysis to allow for future comparisons and trends.

Analysis of Social Protection spending by contingency


HIGHLIGHTS:

The by-contingency analysis confirms that the largest share of social protection spending goes to Old Age and Survivors, notably those in the public sector, and that Poor and Vulnerable Groups are the least benefiting from social protection schemes.

In line with preliminary findings, the contingency/risk analysis confirms that the largest share of spending is on Old Age and Survivors.

When social protection expenditures are analyzed across the lifecycle, the largest share of spending goes to Old Age and Survivors, followed by well-being* and medical care, with very few discrepancies between budgeted and planned amounts. Maternity, Unemployment and Disability get the least share of spending.

Figure 18: Cumulative SP spending by social risk between 2017-2019 (thousands of LBP) - excluding NSSF budget



*Well-being includes spending aimed to improve livelihoods and guarantee access to essential goods and services, such as subsidies, cash transfers and welfare programs.



Two-third of spending on Old Age and Survivors benefit the public sector.

Figure 19: SP spending on old ages (thousands of LBP) - including NSSF budget





Figure 20: SP spending on old ages per beneficiary group



Spending on wellbeing is inflated by fuel subsidies that profit to a large share of the population but are highly regressive.

Figure 21: SP spending on Wellbeing (thousands of LBP)





Figure 22: SP spending on Wellbeing per beneficiary group



Spending on medical care is mostly directed at private sector workers (35.3%) and military personnel (33.6%).

However, in numbers, spending on medical per capita is higher for military personnel since private sector workers outnumber military personnel.

Figure 23: SP spending on Medical care (thousands of LBP)





Figure 24: SP spending on Medical care per beneficiary group



Analysis of Social Protection spending by beneficiary group

HIGHLIGHTS:

Social protection spending is skewed towards public sector beneficiaries, who benefit from more than 45% of allocations while poor and vulnerable groups suffer from recurrent underspending.

Within the public sector, social spending is skewed towards spending on military personnel (32.9% of total spending on the public sector) v/s civil personnel (12.8%).


Poor and vulnerable groups benefit mostly from Social Protection spending by the Ministry of Public Health.

Direct support to private sector workers comes in the form of contributions to syndicates and professional associations to partly finance retirement and pensions schemes. These professional associations have taken the form of NGOs and do not cover all sectors.

Fuel subsidies benefit everyone but are highly regressive.

The analysis in terms of primary beneficiary groups confirms that social protection spending benefits massively to public sector employees (45.9%), to a much larger extent than private sector employees (22.8%).

Figure 25: Spending gap by beneficiary groups (thousands of LBP) – 2017-2019)




Poor budget planning practices stand out, characterized by overspending in the public sector and underspending on social protection to poor and vulnerable groups.

Spending by beneficiary groups points out to weak budget planning practices that result from an overall lack of accurate planning and limited delivery capacity.

It is also worth to mention that the overspending on private sector workers is probably less meaningful and is partly due to the absence of data on NSSF's budgeted spending.

Figure 26: SP spending by beneficiary group (thousands of LBP)




* The last column refers to the pension and end-of-service indemnities paid to both military and civil service personnel and that comes as one aggregated budget line within the budget.

Public Sector

Within the public sector, social spending is skewed towards spending on military personnel v/s civil personnel.

Further investigation is needed to understand if the higher spending on military personnel stems from a higher number of employees or from larger benefits offered to the military.

Figure 27: SP spending by beneficiary group – all public sector groups (thousands of LBP)



■ Budgeted ■ Effective

Despite substantive spending on pensions and end-of-service indemnities, a large share of government employees are still left outside the official protection scheme.

Only retired civil servants on permanent employment regimes benefit from State provided social protection for the elderly. This does not include other categories of personnel enrolled in government such as daily workers and service providers. In addition, effective spending on pensions and end-of-service indemnities exceeds initial budgeted amounts on a recurrent basis. In 2019, related expenses represented 36.1% of total personnel costs or 4.7% of GDP, which is significantly high by international standards, making it fiscally unsustainable.

Figure 28: SP spending by beneficiary group – Public sector civil servants and military personnel (thousands of LBP)





Figure 29: Evolution of spending on pensions and end of service indemnities (thousands of LBP)



Aggregated allocations (2017-2019)	Budgeted	Executed
End of service indemnities	1,465,400,000	2,211,385,336
Pensions	6,574,643,966	6,964,482,516

32,9% of social protection spending benefit military personnel. Its largest share finances their pensions scheme, followed by hospital expenses, hospitalization and school allowances

The military personnel's exclusive share of total effective SP spending over the period 2017-2019 is of 12.51% (excl. retirement and end-of-service indemnities). Adding its share of pensions and end-of-year indemnities (71% according to WB, 2018), SP spending on military personnel reaches 32.9% of total SP spending.

Figure 30: SP spending by beneficiary group – military personnel (thousands of LBP)




Table 3: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

Public sector-Military personnel	Budgeted	Executed
Hospital expenses for security forces	15,140,000	1,263,462,335
Hospitalization expenses for security forces	1,002,940,000	1,239,166,381
School allowances for security forces	761,679,148	769,243,190
Sickness and maternity pay for security forces	244,160,000	223,324,065
Medication for Army	194,850,000	192,011,305
Other	136,993,083	132,793,557
Medication for Internal Security Forces	113,850,000	99,931,878
Other medical expenses for security forces	66,022,000	64,403,649
Total	2,535,634,231	3,984,336,360

Hospital expenses are largely underestimated in the budget law, creating a substantive planning gap among this beneficiary group.

A dive into social benefits of military personnel

The below provides an overview of executed social insurance expenses for military personnel, excluding Retirement & End of Service Indemnities and sickness and maternity for the year 2019.

Figure 31: Other social benefits to security forces (thousands of LBP)



A large amount of government spending on drugs (36%) goes as well to the military

While the MoPH spends a considerable budget on drugs for chronic diseases and cancer, providing access to medication to the most vulnerable, a substantive portion of spending on medication goes to security services and armed forces.

Table 4: Spending on drugs by Government agency

Effective budget – thousands of LBP	2017	2018	2019
Ministry of Agriculture	1,794,000,000	838,092,000	-
Administrative and technical services	1,794,000,000	838,092,000	-
Ministry of Finance	1,459,688,000	1,999,742,000	2,499,302,000
Customs Administration	1,459,688,000	1,999,742,000	2,499,302,000
Ministry of Interior and Municipalities	30,044,352,000	40,424,465,000	40,029,502,000
Directorate General of Internal Security Forces and prisons	26,423,075,000	35,257,256,000	38,251,547,000
Directorate General of General Security	3,621,277,000	5,167,209,000	1,777,955,000
Ministry of National Defense	55,676,134,000	73,332,721,000	63,002,450,000
Army	55,676,134,000	73,332,721,000	63,002,450,000
Ministry of Public Health	195,584,569,000	232,809,061,000	184,231,244,000
General Directorate of Public Health	195,584,569,000	232,809,061,000	184,231,244,000
Ministry of Social Affairs	-	-	-
General Directorate of Social Affairs	-	-	-
Presidency of the Council of Ministers	1,980,135,000	2,423,756,000	2,246,035,000
General Directorate of State Security	1,980,135,000	2,423,756,000	2,246,035,000

12.8% of social spending benefits civil personnel, including education personnel.

Civil personnel's exclusive share of total effective SP spending over the period 2017-2019 is 4.52%. It mostly finances the Sickness and Maternity branch of the NSSF and the Civil Servants' Cooperative, providing for pensions scheme, hospitalization and school allowances. After adding the share of pensions and end-of-year indemnities (29% according to WB, 2018), social protection spending for civil personnel reaches 12.8% of total SP spending.

Figure 32: SP spending by beneficiary group – civil servants (thousands of LBP)





Table 5: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs excl. pensions – sum of 2017,2018,2019 (thousands of LBP)

Public sector-Civil servants	Budgeted	Executed
Government contributions to the civil servant's cooperative	962,700,000	896,693,169
Government Contribution/Sickness and maternity care	792,171,431	-
Family allowances	371,038,958	329,437,065
Government contributions to the Lebanese University teachers' mutual funds	102,950,000	98,866,280
Others	79,320,144	62,510,399
Government Contribution/Family allowances	44,378,035	10,464,811
Government Contribution/End of service indemnities	42,350,695	-
Government contributions to the MPs mutual funds	41,950,000	41,950,000
Total	2,436,859,263	1,439,921,724

An overview of Government's contributions to the Civil Servants' Cooperative

The Civil Servants' Cooperative is a health fund that insurance against work-related accidents and sickness, as well as marriage, birth and education benefits in addition to a wide array of social services for civil personnel in the public sector (it excludes contractual and wage earners of the public sector, staff of autonomous public institutions, teachers in public schools) and their families/dependents. It is financed on the Government budget, through a 6% deduction of civil servants' payroll.


Figure 33: Government contribution to civil servants' cooperative (thousands of LBP)



As well, judges, public sector teachers and Parliament staff are the main categories benefiting from Government transfers to their respective mutual funds to finance social benefits.

The Lebanese University teachers' mutual fund gets the lion's share of government's contributions, providing social benefits to about 2,000 full-time professors.

Figure 34: Government contribution to other mutual funds - Effective spending (thousands of LBP)



Private Sector

Support to private sector workers comes in the form of contributions to syndicates and professional associations.

These allocations finance sickness, retirement and pensions schemes. Other support comes in the form of subsidies, notably for investment loans and on wheat and barley.

Figure 35: SP spending by beneficiary group – private sector workers (thousands of LBP)





Table 6: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

Private sector workers	Budgeted	Executed
Effective allocations paid - Sickness and maternity care	N/A	3,266,183,000
Effective allocations paid - End of service indemnities	N/A	2,639,778,000
Effective allocations paid -family allowances	N/A	960,749,000
Subsidies for investment loans (agriculture, industry, tourism, technology)	510,000,000	393,027,064
National employment office	10,913,086	7,438,456
National center for vocational training	1,886,000	1,400,000
Other	65,233,540	785,500
Contribution to press editor's syndicate	1,224,000	650,000
Contribution to press syndicate	506,800	490,000
Contribution to the common mutual fund	481,250	431,250
Support for forage growers	24,670,000	39,527
Government Contribution/Sickness - taxi drivers	109,957,500	-
Payment due to NSSF	45,000,000	-
Transfers to cover the voluntary program deficit	25,000,000	-
Purchase of wheat and barley	94,980,000	-
Total	889,852,176	7,270,971,797

Government's contribution to these mutual funds take the form of yearly allocations to professional associations registered as NGOs, and in particular to the press.

These allocations are captured under the economic classification 14.2.1 that corresponds to transfers to non-governmental organizations.

Figure 35: Government contributions to other entities – Effective spending (thousands of LBP)



Poor and vulnerable groups

More than 68% of SP spending targeting poor and vulnerable categories is provided by the ministry of public health while only 20% is provided by the ministry of social affairs.

Figure 37: SP spending by beneficiary group – poor and vulnerable categories (thousands of LBP)




Table 7: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

Poor and vulnerable categories	Budgeted	Executed
Hospitalization expenses	1,405,000,000	1,248,997,372
Medication	470,050,000	612,624,874
Social welfare programs	450,000,000	377,068,050
Contributions to private-free schools/primary education	305,000,000	179,876,253
Support fund - amended rent act	160,132,000	-
Enrollment Fee Waivers	105,000,000	-
Social Development centers	81,500,000	65,657,324
Other	73,321,900	113,167,405
Contributions to public hospitals	39,700,000	43,300,000
Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs	26,000,000	-
Rights and Access Program	23,900,000	24,005,981
School meals program	22,000,095	8,339,306
Young Men's Christian Association, chronic disease medication	20,300,000	-
National Poverty Targeting Program (NPTP)	18,000,000	20,490,000
Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs + Development programs	-	26,652,852
Total	3,199,903,995	2,720,179,417

All sectors

Transfers to EDL (eq. to fuel subsidies) benefit to the entire population but are highly regressive and fiscally unsustainable.

Higher-income earners are more likely to consume more fuel, and thus profit more from the subsidy. In 2015, by income, the poorest 20% of the population were already estimated to receive only 6% of the subsidy, while the richest 20% received 55 % (Ministry of Environment & UNDP, 2015).

In addition, Lebanon remains one of the highest spender on energy subsidies among oil-importers in the region, and one of the very few that haven't initiated subsidy reform yet.

Figure 38: SP spending by beneficiary group – all sectors (thousands of LBP)




Table 8: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

All sectors	Budgeted	Executed
Transfers to EDL	6,700,000,000	6,983,384,945
Subsidies for housing loans	100,000,000	200,000,000
Contribution to fund the deficit of the General directorate of Cereals And Sugar beets	40,781,091	-
Lebanese red cross inc. blood bank	39,827,845	24,231,136
Other	37,847,350	12,281,707
Joint Programs with UNICEF for basic medication and vaccines	15,197,500	19,597,500
Total	6,933,653,786	7,239,495,288

Other

Social spending to other entities finances mainly mutual funds as well as the operations of national commissions and councils serving “social” goals notably the National Commission for Lebanese Women and the Higher Council for Childhood.

Figure 39: SP spending by beneficiary group – other (thousands of LBP)




Table 9: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

Other	Budgeted	Executed
Government contributions to other mutual funds	4,150,000	3,250,000
National Commission For Lebanese Women	2,215,256	2,400,880
Higher Council for Childhood	2,030,000	2,096,276
Contribution to private entities	1,120,000	-
Medicines committee	540,000	171,568
Lebanese Council of Women	252,000	140,000
National education scouts	75,600	30,000
National scouts' coordinators	75,600	30,000
Veterinary Association in Lebanon	25,500	10,000
Total	10,483,956	8,128,724

By-pillar analysis of Social Protection spending

HIGHLIGHTS:

Among the five pillars analyzed, Social Insurance gets the largest share of spending, varying between 53% and 63%.

Under Social Assistance, subsidies absorb more than 90% of spending, leaving minimal no room for other effective assistance programs such as the expansion of social safety nets.

Financial access to services privileges access to health rather than to education.

Social welfare records systematic underspending, notably in the Government programs and transfers to SDCs.


Spending on Labor Market Policies finances operations costs rather than effective employment and job activation programs.

A closer look at the five pillars reveal that the largest share of social spending goes to social insurance (varying between 53% to 63%).

It is to be noted that : (1)- social insurance is underestimated as only NSSF executed data was made available; (2)- social assistance is inflated because of the share of fuel subsidies; and (3)- the 8-point expected decrease in social assistance in 2020 corresponds to EDL's subsidy cut of 1,000 billion LBP.

* Budgeted expenses of NSSF are not included in this chart / relevant data could not be collected


Figure 40: Evolution of main pillars by budgeted appropriations (thousands of LBP)



Subsidies, driven by fuel subsidies, compose the largest share of social assistance spending (varying between 16% to 24% of spending).

The analysis of other sub-pillars points to a higher spending on Health than on Education under financial access to services. It also reveals that social welfare and economic inclusion, and labor activation programs receive minimal allocations. Their aggregate share does not exceed 8% of overall social protection spending.

Figure 41: Evolution of disaggregated pillars by effective appropriations (thousands of LBP)




Pillar 1 – Employment related social protection including Social Insurance

Employment related social protection including Social insurance relates to contributory social protection, funded by contributions paid by (or on behalf of) beneficiaries or taxpayers. As with other insurance mechanisms, the purpose of social insurance is to mitigate the impact of risks associated to unemployment, disability, sickness and old age.

There is a substantive financial gap between budgeted and effective spending on social insurance that is further compromising an already fragile NSSF financial position.

The recurrent failure of public institutions* to settle their “employer’s” dues to NSSF (under its 3 branches) – and as shown in the contributions’ graph below - is creating a substantive financial gap between budgeted and effective spending on social insurance. However, these findings need to be further investigated with a more thorough analysis of the NSSF budget.

Figure 42: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Insurance (thousands of LBP)



* Civil servants working in most of public institutions are enrolled in the NSSF scheme and not in the Civil Servants’ Cooperative.


Pillar 2 – Social Assistance

Social assistance is defined as non-contributory social protection which consists of cash and in-kind transfers, and subsidies.

Subsidies absorb more than 90% of the social assistance budget, leaving no room for other effective assistance programs such as the expansion of social safety nets.

Originally considered as an instrument for reducing or mitigating poverty by improving access to basic goods and stabilizing prices, subsidies reform has become long due. Different types of subsidies benefit the Lebanese population, but many are financed through the monetary policy (by BDL) and fall outside the scope of this budget review. Other social assistance programs were budgeted but never effectively disbursed, such as housing assistance. Initially foreseen to support the amended rent act (2017), it was only activated in 2019 to cover for the housing loan program re-initiated as fiscal subsidy, following decades of monetary support to housing.

Figure 43: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Assistance (thousands of LBP)




Pillar 3 – Financial Access to services

Financial access to social services is concerned with addressing cost barriers to the receipt of care, including user fees, out-of-pocket (OOP) payments, or other associated costs (e.g. financial access to healthcare and fees waivers, health insurance, financial access to education, etc.)

Lebanon spent on average four to five times more on financial access to health than on financial access to education.

The drastic drop in effective spending in 2019 is the result of growing pressure on the State’s fiscal resources, trickling from the looming economic and financial crisis: In the Health sector, hospitalization expenses were reduced by around 80 billion LBP, while in the education sector, the government halted its contribution to the private-free schools/primary education. This comes on top of the significant share of spending on healthcare covered under social insurance.

Figure 44: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Financial Access to Services (thousands of LBP)



Pillar 4– Social Welfare

Social welfare defines a non-contributory social protection which includes service interventions as well as the various outreach, case management and referral services that can support the complex needs of families. It also includes the development and support of a social workforce.

Social welfare records systematic underspending, notably in the Government programs and transfers to SDCs.

Despite the wide geographic spread of MOSA through the SDCs, social welfare witnesses systematic underspending that seems to result from institutional and operational inefficiencies and capacity gaps.

Figure 45: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars – Social Welfare (thousands of LBP)




Table 10: Social welfare spending gap by implementing agency - 2019-(thousands of LBP)

Implementing agency	Budgeted	Executed
NGOs	169,774,000.00	147,482,546.00
Government programs	33,171,000.00 <i>Incl. 31,500,000 of transfers to SDCs</i>	12,369,156.00 <i>Incl. 11,401,114 of transfers to SDCs</i>
Private entities	1,317,000.00	775,000.00
TOTAL	204,262,000.00	160,626,702.00

Pillar 5– Economic inclusion and labor activation

Economic inclusion and labor activation encompasses labor regulations which aim to protect employees' rights to decent work, and active labor market policies which aim to promote labor-market entry and access to better employment, assist reemployment by improving job readiness, and improve matching of supply and demand in the labor market.

There is no unemployment protection program.

Lebanon does not have a typical unemployment protection program. Existing expenditure on economic inclusion and labor activation mostly finances the operations of the National Employment Office, in addition to scattered and small-scale labor market training programs. In terms of labor activation programs, subsidies for investment loans in agriculture, industry, tourism and technology have recorded a major set-back of approximately LBP 30 billion that could have been used to support key economic sectors during the crisis.

Figure 46: Spending gap by disaggregated pillars (thousands of LBP)




Table 11: Economic inclusion and labor activation breakdown by program (thousands of LBP)

	Budgeted-2019	Executed-2019
Assistance to workers	15,000.00	-
Contribution to the association of Arab press correspondents	1,296.00	-
Contribution to the national program for nursing	-	-
Development programs	1,800,000.00	-
National center for vocational training	486,000.00	600,000.00
National education scouts	21,600.00	-
National employment office	4,941,581.00	1,000,000.00
National program for local socio-economic development	-	-
National scouts' coordinators	21,600.00	-
Subsidies for investment loans (agriculture, industry, tourism, technology)	130,000,000.00	100,031,490.00

Analysis of Social Protection spending by Implementing agency


HIGHLIGHTS:

The Ministry of Public Health is the higher spender of social spending with a share of 6.29% v/s the Ministry of Social Affairs' share of 2.24%.

Who provides social protection services in Lebanon?

2/3 of Social Protection spending is directly implemented by a public institution (financed by public revenues) whereas 32% is implemented as Government programs rolled-out in partnership with a donor or international organization. A minimal share of 2% is directly disbursed to NGOs and funded by the Government.

Figure 47: SP breakdown by implementing agency – Average share of 2017,2018,2019




The Ministry of Public Health is the largest spender of Social Protection services (outside cross-cutting spending such as social insurance and fuel subsidies), and not the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Figure 48: Appropriation share by line ministries – Average share of effective spending over 4 years

This share is composed of Social insurance expenses (mainly government contributions and social benefits). These expenses are incurred across all line ministries. For the purpose of this study, they were aggregated and isolated into one category so that their weight does not influence the ministries' share of SP spending.

This share is mainly composed of:
 *Pensions and transfers to EDL.
 *Transfers to EDL where budgeted prior to 2018. For ease of data manipulation, the same administrative classification was used for the years 2018-2019 and 2020



Analysis of Social Protection spending by Source of Financing

HIGHLIGHTS:

More than half ($\pm 57\%$) of social spending is financed from the regular budget while about 25% is financed in the form of Treasury advances and around 20% from social contributions.

Donor financing is hardly detectable in the State budget and finances predominantly financial access to health services and cash transfer programs.


Financing gaps are recurrent and indicate weak planning capacities.

Most of the SP expenditure is financed through government revenues

More than half ($\pm 57\%$) of social spending is financed from the regular budget while a quarter is financed in the form of Treasury advances – that were never reimbursed by the benefiting institution.

Most of this spending is financed from revenues that are themselves collected through consumption taxes, such as value added tax (18% in 2019), telecom tax (12%), customs duties, excises on fuel, etc. This means that the whole of society finances social protection – with the poor contributing relatively more than the others: Redistribution remains low.

Figure 49: Effective Social Protection spending by source of financing (percentage share)






A closer look at the contributory v/s tax funded schemes

Around 27 to 29% of social protection is financed through contributions that consist of the Government's payments of its due as an "employer" to the NSSF* and to the Civil Servants' Cooperative, in addition to its contribution to the various Mutual Funds. These contributions can be assimilated to social insurance subsidies for public sector workers.

Table 12: Contribution schemes - (thousands of LBP)

Effective spending	2017	2018	2019
Contributory schemes	2,788,226,618	3,100,385,000	2,978,045,000
NSSF	2,141,414,000	2,314,625,000	2,410,671,000
Government contributions to the civil servant's cooperative	288,843,169	357,500,000	250,350,000
Government contributions to other mutual funds (MF)	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Government contributions to the civil servant's cooperative	288,843,169	357,500,000	250,350,000
Government contributions to the judges' MF	12,000,000	12,000,000	10,800,000
Government contributions to the LU teachers' MF	31,416,280	35,500,000	31,950,000
Government contributions to the legal assistants' MF	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,440,000
Government contributions to the MPs MF	14,000,000	14,000,000	13,950,000
Government contributions to the Parliament employees' MF	2,600,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Government contributions to the Shariah court judges' MF	6,500,000	5,000,000	
Tax funded schemes	6,595,740,602	8,381,262,805	7,995,241,136
Total	9,383,967,220	11,481,647,805	10,973,286,136

* These figures do not capture private sector contributions into NSSF and mutual funds.



About donor financing

It is suspected that the donor share in financing social spending is higher than 0.18%. However, it is either directly spent from outside the budget or integrated in the budget without being earmarked as external financing. Main programs identified in the budget and financed by donors include cash transfers and financial access to health services.


Table 13: Beneficiary group breakdown by programs – sum of 2017, 2018, 2019 (thousands of LBP)

	Programs funded by donor (thousands of LBP)	2017	2018	2019
Financial access to services - health	Joint Programs with UNICEF for basic medication and vaccines	9,798,750.00	-	9,798,750.00
Social assistance - other cash/in-kind type of assistance	Joint Programs with WHO for primary health care	3,350,050.00	7,346.00	500,000.00
	National Poverty Targeting Program (NPTP)	8,490,000.00	6,000,000.00	6,000,000.00
	School meals program		4,842,940.50	3,496,365.00
	Grand Total	21,638,800.00	10,850,286.50	19,795,115.00

Financing gaps are recurrent and indicate a lack of good planning capacities

Financing gaps provide a signal of poor public sector financial management to donors, creditors and key stakeholders. Forecasting errors are inevitable, but recurrent deficits and unreliable planning raise questions about whether the errors from the budgeting process arise from unforeseen events or indicate flaws in the forecasting model used by policy-makers.


Figure 50: Evolution of SP total expenses in thousands of LBP



Financing gaps are recurrent and indicate a lack of good planning capacities

Even if we remove transfers to EDL, the financing gap remains substantial.

Figure 51: Evolution of SP total expenses excluding Transfers to EDL (thousands of LBP)



3

Summary of findings

Key findings

In Figures:

- Lebanon spends around 13.8% of its GDP and 30% of its public expenditures on SP.
- Lebanon's SP spending is higher than neighboring Arab countries but lower than similar middle income countries. However, coverage is among the lowest and most inequitable.
- Social spending is scattered across several functions: 55-65% are classified under the Social Protection function (Function 10), while 27% can be found under the Economic affairs function (Function 4) and about 8% under the Health function (Function 7).
- The largest share of social spending goes to social insurance (53-63% of social expenditures) and mostly on spending on Old Age. This share is believed to be under-evaluated as the NSSF budget was only made partially available for this study.
- The MoPH is the higher spender of social spending with a share of 6.29% v/s MOSA's share of 2.24%. More than 68% of SP spending targeting poor and vulnerable categories is provided by the ministry of public health while only 20% is provided by the ministry of social affairs.
- Currently, spending on old age is largely skewed towards the public sector (totalizing 77.66% of social protection spending v/s 22.3% for the private sector), and notably military personnel.
- Around 32.9% of SP spending benefits to military personnel, in the form of pensions and end-of-year indemnities, hospitalization and school allowances. Around 12.8% goes to civil and education personnel.

Key findings

On programs' effectiveness:

- The discrepancies in spending and the absence of a strategy for social protection, are few of the main reasons behind the poor effectiveness of social protection in addressing and reducing poverty and inequality in Lebanon.
- **Fuel subsidies are draining the government's budget and crowding out social spending.** In 2019, Lebanon spent almost 4 times more on fuel subsidies than on social spending on health and 138 times more than on social spending on education. Subsidies absorb more than 90% of the social assistance budget, leaving no room for other effective assistance programs such as the expansion of social safety nets.
- The mix of fiscal and monetary subsidies makes their reform more complex though it has become inevitable.
- Social welfare spending witnesses systematic underspending that seems to result from institutional and operational inefficiencies and capacity gaps at MOSA.
- The small budget allocated to economic inclusion and labor activation is not allocated and used in ways that can effectively improve access to employment and job readiness while unemployment is on a rising curve.
- Direct support to private sector workers comes in the form of contributions to syndicates and professional associations to partly finance retirement and pensions schemes. However, these professional associations have taken the form of NGOs to be able to benefit from government support and do not cover all sectors.

Key findings

On financing:

- Around two-third of Social Protection spending is directly implemented by a public institution (financed by public revenues) whereas 32% is implemented as Government programs financed jointly on public revenue and donor-funding. A minimal share of 2% is directly disbursed to NGOs and funded by the Government.
- Only less than a quarter is financed from social contribution, while the major share of financing comes through general tax revenue (which is regressive).
- The Donor financing share that was captured through the budget is minimal (less than 1% of social spending). This share is suspected to be higher. In the current budget structure, all grants are aggregated under a single budget revenue line (295) and no further details are published. The share captured mainly provides for cash transfers and financial access to health services.
- Financing gaps are recurrent and indicate a lack of good planning capacities. For instance:
 - Overspending in SP targeting the military reaches 57%.
 - Overspending in SP covering pension schemes reaches 14%.
 - Systematic underspending on economic inclusion and labor activation ranges between 20 and 25%.

4

Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendations

As economic and social indicators are seriously deteriorating in Lebanon, and the national currency is under the pressure of devaluation, it remains essential to protect existing social spending and attempt to maximize its impact.

The situation in the country is further compounded by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent lockdown measures which pose a serious threat to Lebanon's social protection, access to basic social services and economy, particularly affecting the poor and the vulnerable.

The following recommendations address both the policy and operational levels, within the fiscal framework. They rely on the findings of this Budget Review and are motivated by concerns of relevance, coherence, efficiency, value-for-money and sustainability. They don't intend to address the whole social protection sector as a new Strategy is being devised but rather to inform its fiscal aspects. They are divided into short-term and medium-term actions.

They aim to consolidate social spending in order to enhance and potentially expand existing protection schemes. Further investigation on their feasibility might be needed as well as wide consultation on their possible long-term impact.

They shall be analyzed in complementarity with other recommendations aiming to reform social protection schemes.

Recommendations over the short-term

At the Policy level:

- Create fiscal space through a thorough and comprehensive Government Spending Review that would allow to identify potential areas of savings and spending reallocation.
- As social spending is massively financed from Government, and as revenues projections are highly volatile, it is advisable to seek a significant mix in the financing structure of social protection, in particular for emergency social protection spending as economic and social conditions are deteriorating fast.

At Program level:

- Fuel subsidies reform has become inevitable and will probably create both social distress and a fiscal space that will need to be reallocated in the most effective way possible.
- The preparation and publication of reports on social expenditure outturns would be a very useful tool for program planning, monitoring and evaluation.

At the Operational level:

- Enhance fiscal discipline and budget preparation through the:
 1. Upgrade of budget planning practices to reduce the gap between budgeted and effective expenses.
 2. Reduction of fragmentation and enhanced budget comprehensiveness by integrating detailed NSSF budgeted contributions and allocations in the budget proposal and law and by unifying procedures for the various funds that currently apply separate rules as set out in their respective legislation.

Recommendations over the medium-term (1)

At the Policy level:

- Overall expenditures on social protection can be better balanced across beneficiary groups, and investment enhanced for the poor and vulnerable across all contingencies and life-cycle stages.
- The financial sustainability of social protection scheme for civil servants across civil and military personnel could be enhanced and inequities reduced through achieving a better balance in the allocation of government financing between social security for public sector workers on one hand and needed investment for the enhancement of social protection standards for vulnerable groups and segments in society.
- Strengthening progressivity in personal income tax could compensate for increasing inequality in the taxation scheme. As VAT is more elastic to the current price hike, the share of indirect taxes is expected to drastically increase (in both absolute and relative values) on the short and medium term. Given all fiscal constraints (including limitations related to classic financing instruments such as debt), the government's most obvious alternative might be to rely on leveraging more taxes of regressive nature to finance increasing social needs. A first step in that direction was the publication of the Ministry of Finance circular No. 114/S1 dated 15 January 2021 that requires from all business entities to issue their invoices in LBP.
- If pensions reform is to be envisaged, protection for the elderly will need to encourage a mix of contributory participation (including contribution subsidies) and social assistance (i.e. a social pension).
- A better identification and performance of social spending would pass by budget modernization, and when ministries would start to prepare their budget on a program basis.
- Embedding spending reviews into the budgetary process and have its results and conclusions reflected in budget preparation would help increase accountability and ensure more transparency and inclusiveness of budgeting. On the long run, spending reviews could become a permanent feature of budget planning and execution.

Recommendations over the medium-term (2)

At Program level:

- The reallocation of funds within the jobs and labor market activation programs need to further encourage labor demand, improve productivity, improve formalization, improve the skills of workers, and support better matching of individuals to suitable jobs, amid rising unemployment.

At the Operational level:

- The set-up and operation of an integrated financial information management system at MOSA and other social protection entities is critical to track social spending, reduce misallocations and misuse and allow for data-driven decision making at the level of the Government and of donors.
- Develop a social protection “portfolio” of interventions to be prioritized in the budget allocation process. This would require: (i) establishing coordinating procedures, determining priorities, consolidating and providing information to the Ministry of Finance; (ii) building capacity within the Ministry of Finance and train staff on social protection; (iii) sensitizing ministries to report back on actual spending in-year; and (iv) building capacity on data recording and reporting at different levels to ensure that institutions know how to capture social protection information and report it to be included in the national budget.

5

Appendixes

Appendix 1

A comprehensive data set of public expenditures financed from the Budget on Social Protection for the period from 2017 till 2020 has been compiled for this report and is available.

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
Pillar I: Employment related social protection including Social Insurance	Social Insurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowances for social expenditures for security forces Birth allowances for security forces Death allowances for security forces Effective allocations paid - Sickness and maternity care Effective allocations paid -family allowances Effective allocations paid - End of service indemnities End of service indemnities Family allowances Hospital expenses for security forces Hospitalization expenses for security forces Marriage allowances for security forces Medication for Army Medication for customs Medication for General Security Forces Medication for Internal Security Forces Medication for State Security Forces Other medical expenses for security forces Pensions Retired public servants School allowances for security forces Sickness and maternity care Sickness and maternity pay for security forces

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
<p>Pillar I: Employment related social protection including Social Insurance</p>	<p>Contribution</p>	<p>Contribution to press editors' mutual fund Contribution to press editors' syndicate Contribution to press syndicate Contribution to the association of Arab press correspondents Contribution to the common mutual fund Contribution to the social security fund of press owners and journalists Contribution to the syndicate of Lebanese press directors Contribution to the syndicate of press photographers Contribution to veterans General Union, Mutual funds, cooperatives and syndicates of agriculture Government Contribution/End of service indemnities Government Contribution/End of service indemnities - settlements Government Contribution/End-of-service indemnities Government Contribution/Family allowances Government Contribution/Family allowances - drivers Government Contribution/Mayors Government Contribution/Sickness - taxi drivers Government Contribution/Sickness and maternity care Government Contribution/Voluntary program Government contributions to other mutual funds Government contributions to the civil servant's cooperative Government contributions to the judge's mutual funds Government contributions to the Lebanese University teachers' mutual funds Government contributions to the legal assistants' mutual funds Government contributions to the MPs mutual funds Government contributions to the Parliament employees' mutual funds Government contributions to the Shariah court judges' mutual funds Government contributions to the teachers' funds Payment due to NSSF Syndicate of private schools' teachers Teachers' association for primary education Teachers' association for secondary education Transfers to cover the voluntary program deficit Veterinary Association in Lebanon</p>

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
Pillar II: Social Assistance	Housing Assistance	Population and Social Development program Subsidies for housing loans Support fund - amended rent act
	Subsidies	Bread subsidies Contribution to fund the deficit of the General directorate of Cereals And Sugar beets Fuel subsidies Purchase of wheat and barley Support for forage growers Transfers to EDL
	Other cash/in-kind type of assistance	Contribution to private entities Medrar Foundation Mouvement Social National Poverty Targeting Program (NPTP) National program for local socio-economic development Nutrition project Rights and Access Program School books subsidies School meals program Shahid Foundation

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
Pillar III: Financial access to services	Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bone Marrow Transplant Center / Makassed Hospital Children's Cancer Center of Lebanon Contribution to eye bank Contribution to the national organization for Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Contributions to public hospitals Epidemiological Surveillance Program Hospitalization expenses Joint Programs with UNICEF for basic medication and vaccines Joint Programs with WHO for primary health care Lebanese red cross inc blood bank Medication Medication - Ministry of Social Affairs Medicines committee Multiple Sclerosis Center - AUB Primary Health Care Program Red in Circle Association Reproductive Health project Thalassemia Vaccination program Vaccines program Yaduna - Women heart health center
	Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to private-free schools/primary education Enrollment Fee Waivers Enrollment Fee Waivers + School books subsidies Scholarships Transportation

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
Pillar IV: Social Welfare	Social Welfare	Association for the disabled persons - Beyt Chabab Caritas Caritas Lebanon Cedars Medical Association Contribution to associations dealing with delinquent minors Contribution to Caritas Contribution to private entities Druze health establishment - nursing home Foyer De L'amitié - Zahleh Higher Council for Childhood Imam Sadr Foundation Islamic orphanage JAD Foundation Lebanese Child Care Association Lebanese Council of Women Lebanese Welfare Association for the Handicapped Model center for the disabled National Commission For Lebanese Women National program for adult learning National program to support landmines and Cluster Munitions Casualties National Rehabilitation and Development Center Oum El Nour Preventing delinquency programs and special care Protecting juveniles at risk programs Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs Social and health programs in collaboration with NGOs + Development programs Social Development centers Social welfare programs Support for families The National Program for combating begging The National Program for Drug Prevention Young Men's Christian Association, chronic disease medication
	Other cash/in-kind type of assistance	National support program for mine casualties

Appendix 2: Programs included under each Pillar

Pillar	Sub Pillar	Program
Pillar V: Economic inclusion and labor activation	Economic inclusion and labor activation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistance to workers Contribution to the association of Arab press correspondents Contribution to the national program for nursing Development programs National center for vocational training National education scouts National employment office National program for local socio-economic development National scouts' coordinators Subsidies for investment loans (agriculture, industry, tourism, technology)

References

1. Beyond Group (2020), "Social Protection in Lebanon Sector Analysis", Draft version
2. Caroline Vandierendonck (2014), "Public Spending Reviews: design, conduct, implementation", European Economy, Economic Papers 525, URL: https://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2014/ecp525_en.htm
3. CAS (2009), "Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey 2009" (Labour Force Module), URL: <http://www.cas.gov.lb/index.php/all-publications-en#the-multiple-indicators-cluster-survey-round-3-2009-mics3>
4. Davina Jacobs, Jean-Luc Hélig, and Dominique Bouley (2009), "Budget Classification", IMF, URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/tnm/2009/tnm0906.pdf>
5. ESCWA (2020), "Poverty in Lebanon: Solidarity is vital to address the impact of multiple overlapping shocks", Policy Brief.15, URL: https://www.unescwa.org/sites/www.unescwa.org/files/20-00268_pb15_beirut-explosion-rising-poverty-en.pdf
6. Government of Netherlands, IFC, ILO, UNHCR, UNICEF and the WB, "Lebanon Country Vision note", URL: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---ddg_p/documents/publication/wcms_739037.pdf
7. ILO (2021), Vulnerability and Social Protection Gaps Assessment - A microdata analysis based on the Labour Force and Household Living Conditions Survey 2018/19
8. ILO (2017), 'World Social Protection Report 2017 – 19', URL: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/ShowWiki.action;jsessionid=fyNNdzcmzbNsueF5JB1HUYdgsqXinZKUda8Aeqx8K1bjaqUp155m!539423187?id=594&lang=EN>
9. ILO (2015), Towards Decent Work in Lebanon: Issues and Challenges in Light of the Syrian Refugee Crisis, URL: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---arabstates/---ro-beirut/documents/publication/wcms_374826.pdf

References

10. ILOSTAT Data explorer, URL : <https://www.ilo.org/shinyapps/bulkexplorer2/>
11. International Labor Organization World Social Protection Data Dashboards: <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/WSPDB.action?id=13>
12. International Monetary Fund (2020), Regional Economic Outlook: Middle East and Central Asia, URL: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/REO/MECA/Issues/2020/10/14/regional-economic-outlook-menap-cca>
13. International Monetary Fund, Government Finance Statistics (GFS), URL: <https://data.imf.org/?sk=89418059-d5c0-4330-8c41-dbc2d8f90f46&slid=1437488721405>
14. Ministry of Environment and UNDP (2015), "Fossil Fuel Subsidies in Lebanon: Fiscal, Equity, Economic and Environmental Impacts", URL: <http://climatechange.moe.gov.lb/viewfile.aspx?id=218>
15. Ministry of Finance of Lebanon, "Budget Law" 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, URL: <http://www.finance.gov.lb/en-us/Finance/BI/ABDP/>
16. OECD.Stats, Social Expenditure - Aggregated data, URL: https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=SOCX_AGG
17. UNICEF (2019), "Fiscal space for child-sensitive social protection in the MENA region", URL: https://www.unicef.org/mena/media/4991/file/RR36_Fiscal_space_for_child_sensitive_social_protection_in_the_MENA_region.pdf.pdf
18. United Nations Lebanon (2020), "Social Protection in Lebanon: Bridging the immediate response with long-term priorities", UNICEF and ILO under the UN Joint Program on Social Protection and Beyond Group, URL: <https://www.unicef.org/lebanon/reports/social-protection-lebanon>
19. Wim Van Lerberghe, Abdelhaye Mechbal, Nabil Kronfol (2018), "The Collaborative Governance of Lebanon's Health Sector – Twenty Years of Efforts to Transform Health System Performance", MOPH, WHO and AUB partnership, URL: <https://www.moph.gov.lb/userfiles/files/Programs%26Projects/PSO/The-Collaborative-Governance-of-Lebanons-Health-Sector.pdf>

References

19. World Bank Group (2020), "Lebanon Reform, Recovery and Reconstruction Framework (3RF)", URL: <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/948021607068524180/pdf/Lebanon-Reform-Recovery-and-Reconstruction-Framework-3RF.pdf>
20. World Bank Group, UNHCR and the Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement (2020), "Compounding Misfortunes: Changes in Poverty since the onset of Covid-19 on Syrian Refugees and Host Communities in Jordan, the Kurdistan Region of Iraq and Lebanon", URL: <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/878321608148278305/pdf/Compounding-Misfortunes-Changes-in-Poverty-Since-the-Onset-of-COVID-19.pdf>
21. World Bank Group (2018), Public Pensions in Lebanon - Short-term Reform Measures Synchronized with Long-term Pension System Strategy