

Mission East (MEED) Annual Complaints Handling Report – 2025



Background

Mission East (MEED) is committed to being accountable to the affected populations we assist – the beneficiaries and communities where we operate. MEED is an organization that welcomes complaints and feedback on what we do and how we do it, constantly striving to improve our work. Beneficiary Complaints mechanisms (BCM) allow us to improve our programmes and respond swiftly to feedback. They are crucial for preventing and detecting of fraud, corruption, sexual harassment, exploitation, and abuse, as well as other code of conduct breaches. We aim to maintain a well-defined and accessible complaints mechanism, while fostering an organizational culture where complaints are welcomed and addressed. Beneficiary complaints mechanisms are set up in each of the countries where Mission East operates, as well as at headquarters level. We also require our local partner NGOs to set up complaint's mechanisms and feedback on jointly implanted projects.

Objectives of the report:

This report is intended to provide a transparent overview of complaints handling at Mission East, as part of our strategy of being accountable to local population. It follows from Mission East commitment to accountability to affected populations and the Core Humanitarian Standards. The report provides an overview of the complaints received, followed by the actions taken and changes adopted in response to complaints, both for serious/sensitive complaints and standard complaints. There follows a description of the state of Mission East's complaints mechanism, the complaints channels available in each country, and the development of our complaint's mechanisms in 2025 and planned developments for 2026-27.

State of the beneficiary complaints mechanisms

In all Mission East country offices and in most partner NGOs, mechanisms to receive and respond to complaints have been established following consultations with communities. Where partner NGOs do not have the capacity to handle complaints and feedback, Mission East office takes care of this. Complaints are received, logged, and responded to. If necessary, corrective actions are taken, which may include improvement or change of policies. Responses are always provided to complainants.

As our operating modalities in the various countries regularly changes, we adapt our complaints mechanisms accordingly. Although our aim is to have formalized and documented mechanisms in place, we also rely on more informal mechanisms in case community members are not comfortable with the formalized process or when a formalized process is simply not existing (yet).

Most of the complaints are 'standard complaints' about non-sensitive matters typically concerning the implementation of activities, decisions taken or organisational policy. Serious or sensitive complaints could be complaints about corruption, fraud, sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, other abuse of authority, gross misconduct, or malpractice. Due to the serious nature of such complaints and the potential allegations against staff that they represent, such complaints will need confidential handling and the involvement of senior staff at HQ. Our partner organisations are responsible to inform Mission East immediately when a serious complaint has been raised. Depending on their specific requirements and thresholds donors will be informed about complaints we received. Furthermore, as this reporting is made publicly available all, including donors, have access to our complaints reporting.

Complaints can be raised in various ways depending on the local situation and in consultation with the community. The following channels are used:

	HQ	Afghanistan	Ukraine	Tajikistan	Armenia*	Nepal*	Syria*	Lebanon*	Nigeria*	Chad*	Sudan*
Phone line		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		
sms (text messages)		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓			
website form	✓				✓						
phone app (whatsapp, messenger, viber etc.)		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓		
through focal points in communities						✓					
through focal points on safeguarding					✓	✓			✓		✓
face-to-face meetings		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓			
e-mail	✓			✓	✓	✓					✓
box in communities		✓			✓	✓					✓
box in Mission East or partners' office				✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
referrals from partners				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		
Interagency coordination call centers **		✓									

* partner led programs only

** The UNOPS-managed Awaaz Afghanistan provides callers with vital information and serves as a platform for feedback on humanitarian responses as well as the delivery of basic human services.

Overview of Complaints received in 2025

Type	HQ	Afghanistan	Armenia*	Chad*	Lebanon*	Nepal*	Nigeria*	Sudan*	Syria	Tajikistan	Ukraine	Total
Serious complaints	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Standard complaints & feedback	0	25	1	5	0	7	6	3	5	2	0	48
Total	3	25	1	5	0	7	6	3	5	2	0	57

*Partner-led programmes only

Disclaimer: Kindly note that all serious complaints are processed through HQ. For data protection purposes, we log these complaints at HQ level, even if they originate in another location.

2025 Observations and Key Developments

- **New policies:** In 2025, MEED developed and endorsed two key policies related to complaints: The Complaint Policy and the Whistleblowing & Grievance Policy. In addition, MEED developed the Complaint Reporting & Case Management SOP. Combined, these documents aim to streamline and strengthen complaint handling across our organisation.
- **New CFM systems in Syria and Ukraine:** The community feedback and complaint systems in Ukraine and Syria (and Lebanon) are still newly established. We will continue to strengthen these throughout 2026 and therefore expect more data in the next annual report.
- **More cases – greater awareness:** Reported cases are increasing in response to more focus on raising awareness amongst communities on reporting channels and options.
- **Data from partner-led programmes:** Some of our partners – especially in Nigeria and Chad – have very detailed feedback and complaints logs, which include all possible interactions with communities' members during field visits, mixing both feedback and complaints. In Chads presentation of data, they findings are thematic rather than listing all cases individually. Such variations in recording and presentation can obscure the data slightly. We will be working on streamlining methods going forward.
- **Thematic trends in complaint data:** Our standard complaints follow these thematic trends:
 - Complaints about targeting (i.e. households or individuals).

- Complaints about missing materials, products, assistance (incl. training).
- Complaints about low quality or broken items, or sick livestock.
- Complaints about late distribution of assistance.
- Reports about improper conduct by community members in regard to assistance.
- **Discrepancies in reporting:** We still observe that the size of the program doesn't always correlate with the number of complaints. In some contexts, people may worry that a complaint will negatively influence their assistance or community cohesion, resulting in less reporting. This might explain why there is a difference between the various country programs. We continue to raise awareness on our feedback and complaints channels in communities and address any issues related to trust.

Key complaint mechanism actions planned (2026-2027)

- We will review and update our template for reporting on feedback and complaints for MEED country offices, as well as partner led programmes. This is done to ensure stronger harmonisation of data and allow for greater data extraction and comparison.
- To support capacity building on handling feedback and complaints we will develop a standardised training package to be implemented across country offices. For partners and partner-led projects, we will conduct a needs and capacities assessment that will lead to a set of recommendations for further action and support.
- Pending feedback from the CHS renewal audit in the fall 2026, we will seek to integrate this into existing practices. We will work actively to strengthen our work on CHS commitments 5 and 7 related to feedback and learning.
- We will work on our taxonomy of feedback and complaints, to make sure there are clear categories of input for clearly distinguished purposes. We want to make sure both MEED staff, partners and communities we work with fully understand these categories.
- To support this process, we will review our guidance for handling standard feedback and requests, as well as our community engagement strategy.
- Mission East will continue to monitor the status of feedback and complaints in all countries of operations and with partners. All partner organizations will be included in our yearly stock taking of complaints.
- We will continue to strengthen and support newly established complaints mechanisms in Ukraine and Syria.
- Our annual reporting will move to Q1 of the following year to ensure quicker sharing of relevant learning points.

ANNEX A: Details of serious complaints received in 2025

Country & Theme of Complaint	Findings	Outcome / Action taken / Lessons learned
Anonymous allegation of bribery and embezzlement, as well as nepotism and poor management against few staff and leadership of one country.	Complaint not upheld	An extended external investigation ordered by the HQ-CHC concluded that none of the allegations were substantiated with clear evidence. However, we have made changes in the local Accommodation Policy to make it clearer, and the updated global Recruitment & Selection SOP does address the issue of nepotism and reinforce segregation of duty in recruitment or promotion situations.
Allegation of corruption during procurement process in one country.	Complaint not upheld	We conducted an HQ led internal investigation involving a Controller. The Finance and Admin Director concluded the allegation as non-substantiated due to lack of evidence. However, we have reinforced the segregation of duty between the sender of tender and the bids recipient and clarified roles in procurement.
Complaint about discrimination for terminating an employment contract at the HQ	Complaint not upheld	Mission East's lawyer has addressed the complaint and concluded it as non-substantiated due to no clear evidence. No further action needed.

ANNEX B: Details of standard complaints received in 2025

No.	Country & Themes of Complaint	Findings	Outcome/ Action Taken/ Lesson Learned
Afghanistan			
01	The person said that some poor beneficiaries were surveyed, but their names are not in the distribution list.	Complaint not upheld	The problem was recorded and shared with the field team. After checking, it was found that they were not selected as a beneficiary since they did not meet the criteria.
02	The individual stated that 12 families had been registered but were subsequently rejected.	Complaint upheld	The case was verified through field observation and discussion with the technical team. It was confirmed that the affected families were impacted by the disease. Technical guidance was provided, and the team was advised to consider the situation when reviewing the beneficiaries.
03	An individual submitted a complaint that the community planned to redistribute the wheat among the remaining community members.	Complaint upheld	The concern was discussed with community members, and the FAO policy was explained to prevent redistribution of the wheat.
04	An individual submitted a complaint regarding the selection of beneficiaries and expressed his concern about why he was not chosen by the Mission East team as a beneficiary.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was reviewed with the relevant project/programme team, and the beneficiary selection records were checked against the approved selection criteria and targeting process. The selection process was explained and verified to ensure that beneficiaries were selected based on the established vulnerability and eligibility criteria, available project resources, and the agreed targeting methodology. The complainant's case was also reviewed to determine whether the individual met the applicable selection criteria. Based on the review, no evidence of improper selection or preferential treatment was identified.
05	Multiple individuals submitted a complaint regarding the late distribution of MEED assistance.	Complaint upheld	The reason for the delayed distribution is that the donor has not yet transferred the funds to the bank, primarily due to the daily fluctuations in the USD exchange rate.
06	An individual submitted a complaint stating that the Community Development Committee (CDCs) and other community members pressured beneficiaries who received cash and Blanket assistance to divide the funds equally among all individuals in the village.	Complaint upheld	The complaint was reviewed and followed up by the relevant project/MEAL team through discussions with the complainant, CDC members, and relevant community members. The concern regarding pressure on beneficiaries to share their cash and Blanket assistance with other community members was discussed and clarified. The team reminded the CDC and community representatives that assistance is provided to identified eligible beneficiaries based on the agreed project targeting criteria, and beneficiaries should not be pressured, coerced, or instructed to share or redistribute the assistance received. The CDC/community representatives were advised to respect beneficiary rights and the agreed targeting process.
07	An individual has submitted a complaint concerning the beneficiary selection process for cash assistance provided by MEED. He noted that in some households, as many as six individuals have received cash assistance, which raises concerns about the fairness and transparency of the selection criteria.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was investigated by reviewing the beneficiary/recipient selection and cash assistance records in the village. The information was also cross-checked with the relevant project records and field-level information. The investigation found no evidence of any household in the village where six individuals had received cash assistance. The beneficiary records reviewed were consistent with the established selection and eligibility criteria. Therefore, no case of multiple individuals from the same household receiving cash assistance as described in the complaint was identified, and no corrective action was required.
08	An individual submitted a complaint about the beneficiaries selection process.	Complaint upheld	The complaint was reviewed with the relevant project and field team. The beneficiary selection process was cross-checked against the beneficiary selection criteria and the vulnerability assessment conducted during the project. The team also reviewed the information regarding the households identified by the complainant as relatively well-

			off and receiving regular financial support from family members abroad. The complainant's reported disability and vulnerability status were also considered during the review. All the beneficiaries has been selected based on the well-being process.
09	A person claimed that due to someone's complaints, another person, had been deleted from the beneficiary list while he is poor and eligible.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was received via the MEAL compliance number and shared with the ER team. After investigation, it was found that he did not meet the project criteria, and therefore was not selected under the activity. The community was fully engaged in the beneficiary selection process.
10	A community member complained that a relatively wealthy individual had been selected for the shelter repair activity, while some poorer households in the village were not included.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was received through the MEAL compliance number and referred to the ER team for follow-up. A joint MEAL and ER team visited the village and investigated the concern. The investigation confirmed that the individual had been selected by the community and met the eligibility criteria for the activity.
11	A villager complained that a rich man is targeted under the shelter repair activity; while the team has left some poor people in the village.	Complaint not upheld	The issue was shared with the ER team; they replied: ME has targeted all the flood-affected households and families the district. The people who complained about not being targeted are not eligible or not living in targeted area and have has shifted to other areas, and didn't communicated and connected with us during beneficiary selection.
12	Beneficiaries complained that the targeted number for shelters is less compared to the level of affected households in the village.	Complaint not upheld	The targeted number of beneficiaries is adequate. ME selected all the households whose residential homes were affected by the flash floods. Some HHs that were seasonal homes (used only in summer) and gardens were destroyed, but since they don't meet the criteria , they were not selected.
13	Some residents raised complaints regarding the beneficiary selection process, stating that it was not conducted properly through community heads and the ME team.	Complaint not upheld	The issue was shared with ER team, they replied: ME has targeted all the flood affected households and families. The people who have complained regarding to not being targeted, whether they are not eligible or not living in targeted area and has shifted to other areas, and didn't communicated and connected with us during beneficiary selection.
14	A person expressed dissatisfaction with the distribution of assistance to ineligible individuals.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was received via MEAL BCM numbers. The issue was shared with the ER team, and a joint team comprising MEAL and ER members met with the complainant and noted their suggestions. The ER team responded that the beneficiary list was selected through a participatory process with the community. They explained that it may not be possible to include all households, as the number of targeted beneficiaries is lower than the total number of community requests.
15	Community members complained about the quality of local materials for the canal.	Complaint upheld	The complaint was verified during a Mission East staff site visit. The size of the boulders being used for the canal was checked and found not to meet the required specifications. The construction activities were temporarily suspended, and the supplier was contacted and instructed to replace the non-compliant boulders in accordance with the contractual requirements. The supplier replaced the boulders with the required larger size, and the materials were verified before the activities resumed. The issue was therefore addressed and corrective action was completed.
16	An individual complained that the goats that have been distributed are dying (the symptoms are loss of appetite, salivation, and a feeling of fullness in the stomach).	Complaint not upheld	During the follow-up, all goats were found to be in good condition, and no goats showing the reported symptoms or signs of illness were identified. Based on the verification, the reported issue could not be confirmed at the time of investigation.

17	Beekeeping beneficiaries complained that they have received a bee box, but they did not know how to rear the bees; they are requesting training and some extra sugar for bee feeding during the winter.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was verified during MEAL Assistant field visits and was communicated to the FSL team for follow-up. The FSL team confirmed that all beekeeping beneficiaries had received beekeeping training as part of the project support. The team also acknowledged the need for continued technical guidance and confirmed that refresher beekeeping training will be conducted before future distributions to ensure beneficiaries have the necessary knowledge and skills to properly manage and rear bees.
18	Kitchen gardening beneficiary complained that they had not received processing machines.	Complaint upheld	The complaint was communicated to the Program Team for verification. The team was requested to check the procurement, availability, and distribution records of the processing machines for the kitchen gardening beneficiaries. The issue was followed up to determine whether the machines had been procured and, if so, why they had not yet been distributed to the concerned beneficiaries. Appropriate follow-up action was initiated to ensure that the pending inputs are distributed to eligible beneficiaries in accordance with the project plan.
19	Community members have complained that the construction materials for the irrigation canal were not delivered to the project site sufficiently (only 3 vehicles of local stone have been delivered). Despite this, the irrigation canal for 6 villages has been cut, which has resulted in a serious shortage of water for agricultural irrigation, particularly for rice (shali) processing. In addition, the canal has cut the village's electricity, causing disruption to the community's power supply.	Complaint upheld	The WASH and procurement teams have conducted a meeting with materials contractors and community members regarding the matter. The problem will be solved as soon as possible.
20	A community member has submitted a complaint stating that someone took 4 packages of ME (one beekeeping, one goat, one KG and one poultry package).	Complaint not upheld	After the follow-up, we found out that there is no duplicate beneficiary who received multiple assistance packages.
21	Some community members have complained that after the distribution of goats, certain community elders took one goat from the distributed livestock, which was originally intended for beneficiary households.	Complaint not upheld	The investigation found no evidence that any community elder had taken or received a goat intended for beneficiary households. The distribution was confirmed to have been carried out as planned, and no further action was required.
22	An individual complained about the recent beekeeping and goat distribution. Mission East has distributed beekeeping equipment to five beneficiaries and goats to another five beneficiaries. However, following the distribution, some community members, who claim credit for bringing the MEED activities to the village, collected all the bee boxes and goats from the beneficiaries. They then sold these items to individuals outside the village, and they are going to distribute the money equally among the villagers.	Complaint upheld	The problem has been solved by the MEED team and the government representative.
23	Two villagers complained that the saplings were planted in an area where there was no water available, resulting in the saplings drying out. No follow-up visit has been made to inspect the condition of the plantation. Additionally, community members have not received any response despite submitting several complaints.	Complaint not upheld	The compliance case was received by the MEAL team through the compliance hotline numbers. The issue was shared with the FSL team, and they provided the following response: Mission East has established a reforestation initiative in the mentioned village. A water supply system for irrigating the saplings was also constructed and handed over to the community. However, due to the community's lack of proper care, the saplings are drying out.
24	A person complained that he did not receive greenhouse inputs while his name was on the beneficiary list; instead, another person received the greenhouse inputs.	Complaint not upheld	The complaint was received via BCM number. The issue has been shared with the FSL department. After joint investigations, it was clarified that the person was selected under Kitchen Gardening and had already received the inputs. However his name was on the greenhouse activity by error, so he was replaced with the other person.

25	We have received complaints that community elders in one part of the village collected selected beneficiaries' fertilizers and certified wheat seed and redistributed them among all villagers.	Complaint upheld	FSL colleagues coordinated with DIAL. The MEAL Assistant, together with a DAIL representative, visited the village and held a meeting with community members and elders. After the discussion, the problem was resolved—all distributed packages were collected and re-distributed to the originally selected beneficiaries.
Armenia			
01	Complaint received from a parent of a child participating in the project concerning a reasonable accommodation issue the child was facing at school.	Complaint upheld	BoH staff approached the school and discussed the child's individual accessibility needs and possible reasonable accommodation with the school staff. Together, we found a practical solution by adapting the desk/table in the front row so that the child's wheelchair could be comfortably and safely accommodated there. The adjustment was made, allowing the child to sit in the front row and see the blackboard more clearly. The complaint was resolved.
Chad			
01	Insufficient water availability during the dry season and low flow rates at certain water points.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
02	Inadequate access to latrines, handwashing facilities, and water treatment products.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
03	Insufficient agricultural inputs needed to maintain production.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
04	Low water source yields and high pumping costs reduce irrigated areas.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
05	Inadequate fencing to protect gardens from animals, a source of tension or conflict.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
Nepal			
01	The chairman of a Farmers group complained that more input support and FFS should be established in the village.	Complaint upheld	Then project team brief about the project modality and its limitations regarding establishment of FFS and assured that based on the project modality input support will be provided.
02	A person raised a concern regarding the plantation program conducted in a village for slope stabilization and soil erosion control . Some trees were planted on her land, which had been damaged by flooding and left abandoned. She expressed dissatisfaction that she did not get the opportunity to participate in the plantation activities or receive payment for pit preparation and plantation work, as these activities were carried out by other villagers. She also stated that she had not been informed about the activity because she was away from the village at the time of the community meeting and was unaware that the land was privately owned.The case highlighted the importance of verify the landowners before finalizing construction sites.	Complaint upheld	Counseled the complainant on the purpose and benefits of the plantation activity, explaining how it contributes to slope stabilization and soil erosion control, and how the trees planted on her abandoned land could provide a future source of timber.
03	The Ward Chairperson raised concerns after a proposed site was not selected. The ward chairperson selected landowner initially declined to provide the required stones and shown less interest ,resulting in the cancellation of the planned construction at that site. Following further discussion, the Ward Chairperson committed to arranging the stones, while the project agreed to provide the 4 gabion box and labor costs. The case highlighted the importance of confirming community contributions and obtaining clear commitments from landowners and local authorities before finalizing construction sites.	Complaint upheld	Discussed with the Ward Chairperson and agreed that the Ward Office would arrange the required stones, while the project would provide 4 gabion boxes and labor costs.
04	A project beneficiary reported alleged financial irregularities during the distribution of IEC materials. The complaint concerned suspected submission of fraudulent refreshment receipts and discrepancies in reimbursement claims.	Complaint upheld	HEAD Nepal conducted a detailed investigation, verified the financial discrepancies, obtained written clarification from the concerned staff member, and reviewed the case through the relevant committees. Based on the findings, the staff member's contract

			extension was revoked, and full financial restitution was mandated. The Executive Board ratified the investigation findings and decisions on 8 January 2026.
05	A man was left out during the input distribution of sustainable farming (Greenhouse sheet, garden pipe and seasonal vegetable seeds) as he is a person with disability.	Complaint upheld	He will be given priority in next round of the project support.
06	Complained about the beneficiaries selection for input (Goat) distribution. She said that most of the beneficiaries are from upper class and a household without disabilities.	Complain not upheld	Responded through phone that the selection was done through ward office and ward chair was consulted regarding the complaint and responded A and B Category of disabilities are not left out in the communities but few households are selected based on their other marginalized category
07	Disability ID card distribution camp was not effective, even they did not ID card after taking photos. Snacks were not provided during the meeting.	Complain not upheld	Provided information regarding to the project provision regarding to snacks. Community people were asked to visit their ward office and RM office for obtaining disability ID Card.
Nigeria			
01	Households reported batteries draining quickly, holding little charge, or showing a persistent "battery too low" status that prevented cooking.	Complaint upheld	Support officers cleaned and re-seated connections, adjusted settings, and replaced genuinely degraded cells; most were resolved on site.
02	In the dusty environment, solar panels accumulate dust that reduces charging, so a large share of these are routine panel cleaning and clearing. Others involved panel positioning, loose wiring, or a panel not feeding charge; a few required replacement.	Complaint upheld	Complaints have been handled and improvements made to implementation.
03	Loose, corroded or disconnected connectors and cabling between panel, battery and unit – a common result of daily handling.	Complaint upheld	Officers checked, re-seated or replaced connectors and cables; generally quick to resolve.
04	Units needing a software upgrade or update to correct settings or apply a manufacturer (Pesitho) improvement.	Complaint upheld	Resolved by applying the upgrade during the visit.
05	The most technical category – the internal circuit board, power/MCU board or integrated circuit. Units would not power on despite a charged battery.	Complaint upheld	Resolution required board or component replacement, and these were the most likely to be escalated or need a second visit.
06	A group complained that the unit would not power on or was "working but not cooking."	Complaint upheld	On inspection these traced back to one of the causes above – a depleted battery, a panel not charging, a loose connector, or a failed power board – rather than being a separate fault, and were resolved by addressing the underlying component.
Sudan			
01	A community complained about Jerry Can distribution.	Complaint upheld	LM team added the case to their new distribution plan.
02	Community members expressed concern that the chlorine level (FRC) in the water trucks was too high.	Complain not upheld	The LM WASH team monitored water chlorination using a Pooltester. They ensured that Free Residual Chlorine (FRC) levels remain between 0.2 and 0.5 mg/l.
03	Complaint regarding cleaning tools at GP. Households are blocked from using them for garbage collection, as tools are restricted to Hygiene Committee members.	Complaint upheld	LM team conducted a meeting with GP Committee and explained the purpose of distribution of cleaning tools.
Syria			
01	Someone claimed that we did not adhere to the mandatory registration criteria. Specifically, he stated that five of the selected beneficiaries are employees, which he considered a violation of the conditions we set. He also claimed to have been rejected as a beneficiary because he had received a cow, which he denied.	Complaint not upheld	After reviewing the names, it was proven that one name had been rejected, one name does not appear in staff lists, and three names were beneficiaries, not staff. It was also proven that claimant had indeed received a cow and a calf from a livestock grant and that both animals were still in his possession.
02	A person complained about not being selected for assistance.	Complaint not upheld	The person was informed that she doesn't match the criteria. Having a family member with disability is a mandatory criterion but the son of the mother has cancer, which isn't considered a disability case.
03	The complainant stated that we have accepted employees into our program, which does not align with the established criteria.	Complaint not upheld	The provided names were verified, and it was confirmed that none of them is employed.

04	A complainant had erroneously been accepted for assistance (incl. provision of a cow and a training). He was instructed to prepare a space for the cow but was then informed that it had been an error. He is complaining about the cost he incurred to rehabilitate the space and about the inaccuracy of the provided information.	Complaint upheld	Following coordination between the Finance, Programs, MEAL, and Logistics departments, MEAL coordinator contacted the beneficiary and requested a detailed breakdown of the incurred costs. The submitted prices were reviewed and assessed by the Logistics Officer and were found to be in line with prevailing market rates. An amount of USD 430 was subsequently transferred to the beneficiary.
05	The person complained that she had not been included in assistance, despite being in need.	Complaint not upheld	The field team investigated and found that the person lives outside the intervention zone.
Tajikistan			
01	Concern regarding the poor quality of cement blocks delivered by a subcontractor. The blocks were reported to be still wet, partially damaged, or fully broken, and therefore unsuitable for use.	Complaint upheld	In line with MEED's accountability procedures, the concern raised was immediately referred to field staff. A prompt site visit was conducted to assess the reported issue, and it was confirmed that the delivered cement blocks did not meet the required quality standards. MEED formally instructed the subcontractor to replace all substandard and damaged cement blocks. Within a few days, new cement blocks of appropriate quality were delivered to the village. The complaint was fully resolved through the replacement of all inadequate materials. Construction activities were able to continue using materials that complied with technical and quality requirements.
02	A concern was raised by a partner about delays in delivery of assistive devices (wheelchairs) to the selected target beneficiaries.	Complaint not upheld	MEED explained to the partner that the organization follows its established Procurement Procedure to ensure that the procurement of wheelchairs is carried out in a transparent, accountable, and compliant manner. Although this process may require additional time, Mission East will closely monitor procurement timelines and coordinate with suppliers to minimize delays and facilitate the timely delivery of hearing devices to the selected beneficiaries.