FOOD SECURITY SECTOR WORKING GROUP
Coordination Meeting

24 NOVEMBER, 2015
Venue: MoSA Conference Room

Agenda

1. **Update on LCRP (WFP/FAO)**

2. Gender mainstreaming and sex disaggregated data (FAO)

3. Update on desk formula (WFP)

4. WFP Update – 2016 (WFP)

5. Coordination of identified cases – strengthening of referral system

6. AOB

   a. Introduction of New WFP Sector Coordinator

LCRP 2016 - Update

- Inception workshop on 10 September - launch date in mid December.

- Follow up Core Group Meetings & LCRP Partner Meetings to agree on:

  - *Situation analysis / strategy*
  - *Sector results logframe*
  - *Official Sector targets*
  - *Budgets / unit costs*
  - *Partner targets*

- Sector Strategy:

  - *Mid October – Late October: Reviewed by Core Planning Team & Joint Technical Task Force (JTF) members (rewritten by Core Group)*
  - *Endorsed by the JTF on 4 November (pending final JTF comments)*
  - *At present, the narrative is with the editor for a final edit.*
  - *We will circulate when final.*

Sector Results Logframe: Four Pillars of Food Security

- **Outcome 1 - Food Availability:**

Food availability improved through in-kind food assistance and the development of sustainable food value chains.

- **Outcome 2 - Food Access:**

Improved food accessibility through food assistance and agricultural livelihoods.

- **Outcome 3 - Food Utilization:**

Improved food safety and nutrition practices through the promotion of consumption of diversified and quality food.

- **Outcome 4 - Stabilization:**

Stabilization promoted through enhanced information on food security, coordination of agriculture activities and support of national institutions.

→ *See handout*

LCRP 2016:
Brief Overview of Food Assistance Targeting

- ## *LCRP 2016: Needs based approach:*

  → All targeting based on proven needs / evidence
  → See Food assistance targeting handout

Cohort	Target (individuals)
Syrian Displaced	830,320
Lebanese	62,000
PRS	42,000
Total	**934,320**

Targeting – For Cash Based Food Assistance

- OUTCOME 2:   Promote food Access
- OUTPUT 2.1:   Improve direct access to food / Cash based transfers for food

Consolidated Overview	Official Sector Targets	Actual Partner Targets - Cash Based Assistance	Under / Over Targeting
Syrians	790,120	733,968	-56,152
PRS	42,000	43,119	1,119
PRL	0	201	201
Lebanese	57,000	58,590	1,590

➜ The <u>targets submitted by partners</u> on Activity Info, more or less matches the official sector targets agreed in October (overall and by governorate) for all cohorts.

➜ <u>Under / Over Targeting:</u> For Syrians the number is a little low but for PRS and Lebanese, the actual targets are a little higher but will allow for possible gap-filling.

➜ <u>Coordination</u> with WFP (on Syrian displaced), NPTP/MOSA (on Lebanese) and UNWRA (on PRS/PRL) to avoid duplication and overlaps, should be initiated.

Targeting – For In Kind Food Assistance

- OUTCOME 1:   Promote food availability
- OUTPUT 1.1:   In Kind Food Assistance

Overview	Official [REGULAR] Sector Targets For In Kind Assistance	Actual Partner Targets: REGULAR In Kind Assistance	Actual Partner Targets: "ADDITIONAL" In Kind Assistance (e.g. Ramadan, winter)
Syrians	40,200	12,079	153,525
PRS	5,000	5,800	10,500
PRL	-	200	3,500
Lebanese	5,000	1,638	6,680

➔ The targets submitted by partners on Activity Info, were underline significantly higher than the official targets due to inclusion of "seasonal or one off" additional activities, which provides food parcels for e.g. Ramadan or winterization.

➔ Distinguish between "regular" from the "additional" targets (*reference notes included Sector Strategy*)

➔ Partners appealing for "additional" food assistance (winter or Ramadan), will remain in the appeal. Any additional assistance can still be reported on even if it is not in the appeal.

➔ Coordination with UNWRA should be initiated.

	Akkar	Baalbek Hermel	Bekaa	Mont Liban	Nabatiye	Nord	Sud	TOTAL	
OUTCOME1: Promote food availability									
Output-1.2: Enhance small scale and family farming production and adoption of climate smart technologies									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # of farmers with enhanced farming production	2,732	1,158	1,552	6,536	3,776	3,583	3,385	22,722	ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, FAO, MoA, OXFAM, PU, RI, SHEILD, SIF, Solidarites
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	**6,185**	**1,224**	**1,702**	**3,011**	**11,130**	**3,311**	**7,983**	**34,546**	
Difference btw appeal and sector target	3,453	66	150	(3,525)	7,354	(272)	4,598	11,824	
# of partners appealed	8	3	4	4	6	4	6	11	
Output-1.3: Marketing of small scale and family farming supported									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # of producers with increased access to market	2,845	1,323	940	4,294	3,045	3,486	2,651	18,584	ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, DRC, FAO, MoA, OXFAM, PU, SCI, SHEILD
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	**1,219**	**634**	**954**	**479**	**1,729**	**759**	**1,749**	**7,523**	
Difference btw appeal and sector target	(1,626)	(689)	14	(3,815)	(1,316)	(2,727)	(902)	(11,061)	
# of partners appealed	8	4	6	4	6	4	6	10	
Output-1.4: Reduced food wastage and losses									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # of individuals assisted to reduce food wastage and losses	2,953	1,988	1,013	2,629	2,750	2,994	2,118	16,445	ACTED, CONCERN, FAO, MoA, OXFAM, PU
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	**2,926**	**491**	**495**	**558**	**1,706**	**1,132**	**2,081**	**9,389**	
Difference btw appeal and sector target	(27)	(1,497)	(518)	(2,071)	(1,044)	(1,862)	(37)	(7,056)	
# of partners appealed	6	2	3	3	4	3	4	6	

Output 1.2: The targets submitted by partners on Activity Info, were higher than the targets set by the sector. The higher partner targets is explained by the aggregation of the different activities that could target the same farmer. It was decided to keep the sector targets as set.

OUTCOME2: Promote food accessibility									
Output-2.2: Support agricultural institutions for agricultral livelihoods									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # of institutional sites assisted/created	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	150	ACF, ACTED, AVSI, CONCERN, DRC, FAO, MoA, PU, RI, SCI, SHEILD
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	123	65	69	49	118	43	91	558	
Difference btw appeal and sector target	102	44	48	28	97	22	70	408	
# of partners appealed	8	4	6	4	7	3	6	11	
Output-2.3: Support to private agriculture investment									
SECTOR SET TARGET:# of farmers supported through programs enhancing access to agricultural asset	1,955	1,037	752	2,885	2,124	2,285	1,799	12,837	ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, FAO, NPA, PU, SCI, SHEILD, Solidarites
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	1,600	710	1,160	610	830	750	720	6,380	
Difference btw appeal and sector target	(355)	(327)	408	(2,275)	(1,294)	(1,535)	(1,079)	(6,457)	
# of partners appealed	5	2	4	2	5	3	6	9	
Output-2.4: Communal assets (terracing, irrigation system...) and agriculture labor market strenghtened									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # targeted individuals employed in the agriculture sector								30,000	for all activites under 2.4: ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, DRC, FAO, OXFAM, PU, SCI, SHEILD, Solidarites, UNICEF
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	2,850	480	2,075	-	185	200	120	5,910	
Difference btw appeal and sector target								(24,090)	
# of partners appealed								11	

Output 2.2: the targets submitted by partners on Activity Info were higher than those set by the sector, and the reason behind this difference was the addition of an activity based on partners request in the partners appeal database. It was agreed to increase the sector target from 150 to 500 institutional sites assisted/created.

Output 2.4: the targets submitted by partners were lower than those set by the sector, and this was due to the different level of monitoring indicators of activities compared to the output level (where the impact of activities is captured). Three options were discussed: 1) change the wording of the output level indicator; 2) identify a proxy percentage to assess the impact of the support on the actual employment levels; 3) leave the indicators as they are as they represent different level of reporting.

OUTCOME3: Promote food utilization	Akkar	Baalbek Hermel	Bekaa	Mont Liban	Nabatiye	Nord	Sud	TOTAL	
Output-3.1: Improved good nutritional practices									
SECTOR SET TARGET: DisSyr: # of individuals supported with nutritional practices (trained+gardens)								6,000	ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, DRC, FAO, OXFAM, PU, RI, WV
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	6,242	2,797	5,017	8,452	1,272	212	4,302	28,294	
Difference btw appeal and sector target								22,294	
# of partners appealed								9	
SECTOR SET TARGET: PRS: # of individuals supported with nutritional practices (trained+gardens)								1,000	
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	86	176	236	86	196	86	316	1,182	
Difference btw appeal and sector target								182	
# of partners appealed								3	ACF, DRC, FAO
SECTOR SET TARGET: LEB: # of individuals supported with nutritional practices (trained+gardens)								3,000	
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	1,458	1,003	1,063	448	248	88	318	4,626	
Difference btw appeal and sector target								1,626	ACF, ACTED, DRC, FAO, OXFAM, RI
# of partners appealed								6	
Output-3.2: Food safety measures and policies enhanced									
SECTOR SET TARGET: # of individuals trained on food safety measures								250	
TOTAL PARTNERS APPEALED TARGET	656	96	1,513	36	786	366	1,106	4,559	ACF, ACTED, CONCERN, FAO, MoA
Difference btw appeal and sector target								4,309	
# of partners appealed								5	

Output 3.1: Partners submitted higher targets on this output, specifically for displaced Syrians, as the sector has set its targets based on the previous knowledge in partners interest in similar activities. It was decided to leave the targets as set by the sector, due to the fact that the activities are new to the sector and will be tested during 2015-2016.

Agenda

1. Update on LCRP (WFP/FAO)

2. **Gender mainstreaming and sex disaggregated data (FAO)**

3. Update on desk formula (WFP)

4. WFP Update – 2016 (WFP)

5. Coordination of identified cases – strengthening of referral system

6. AOB

   a. Introduction of New WFP Sector Coordinator

Gender Mainstreaming and Sex Disaggregated Data

Introduction

- The Gender Mainstreaming Strategy strategy is considered a pioneer step which reflects MoSA's commitment towards international conventions especially CEDAW.

- It was developed within the context of "Promoting Women's Participation in Local Governance and Development" project, a project funded by the Italian Embassy in Beirut - Italian Cooperation Office for Development, in collaboration with the Collective for Research and Development/Action - CRTDA

- The gender mainstreaming strategy is a five-years strategy which lays out a framework and sets an action plan to promote gender equality across the Ministry of Social Affairs.

- It reflects and builds on the findings and recommendations of the gender review and the gender analysis for selected programs within MoSA.

Gender Audit

- This gender audit exercise seeks to build bridges and explore possibilities for supporting internal processes for gender mainstreaming and for identifying gaps in capacity building required to support existing or potential efforts for gender mainstreaming.

- Information was gathered using four main methods:

1- Desk review for the overall organizational strategies and plans.

2- Employee self-assessment as a survey on knowledge, attitude, behavior and practice survey (712 questionnaires).

3- Focus group discussions targeted representatives of departments and programs, partners, beneficiaries, and field operators. (28 focus group)

4- In-depth interviews with heads of departments and programs

Main Findings:

- Lack of a working definition of "gender".
- Lack of understanding of methods and processes of gender mainstreaming.
- Lack of trained human resources in implementing gender mainstreaming.
- Lack of an organizational body targeting women in the public sphere.

Gender Analysis of Selected MoSA Projects

- The assessment covered three MoSA's programs (NPTP, Development Project, and THCC) in an attempt to understand where do the programs stand in terms of gender sensitivity and what specific measures can be taken to mainstream gender into their work.

- The assessment addressed key areas such as perception, design, staffing, management, beneficiaries, work environment, information, impact, and budget.

Recommendations

- The gender analysis suggests recommendations to mainstream gender across the project management cycle:

1- Project planning: revision of existing projects' plans, activities, and learning materials.

2- Project Management: staff involvement, and the development of internal gender policies, capacity building programs, and training modules.

3- Project Implementation: Awareness – raising sessions and follow up mechanism to regularly monitor gender indicators

4- Project Evaluation: introduction of sex segregated data, and development of an internal information management system.

Organization of the GMS

- *The first part* presents international framework along with the key national commitments reflecting the State political will towards gender equality.

- *The second part* presents a realistic plan with appropriate steps to be taken as a guide for active use, along with a monitoring plan to track the changes of MoSA's behavior towards mainstreaming gender in its policies and programs.

- The strategy addresses MoSA's organizational level, Operational/Development Program Level, Cultural and Social Level.
- The strategy aims at five outreaching outcomes:

1. Institute a gender mainstreaming committee at the policy level within MoSA (gender committee and gender focal points).
2. Reduce the gender-gap in perceptions of concepts related to gender roles and gender based division of labor among MoSA employees through capacity building programs.
3. Socially and economically empower women and girls and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies through awareness-raising sessions and financial grants
4. Develop gender –responsive/specific processes in all MoSA services and projects targeting all citizens.
5. Strengthen and consolidate partnerships with other government departments, research and study centers at universities, with civil society and external agencies

- The monitoring and evaluation plan presents means to learn and to improve a possible next phase of activities depending on certain means of verifications and indicators.

Suggested activities	Indicators
Establish a gender committee	Ministerial degree , scope of work, …
Assign gender focal points	Number of gender focal points assigned
Gender training sessions	Number of training conducted
Provide financial grants to women	Number of financial grants provided
Coordinate with media institutions	Number of media articles discussing gender
Publications and distributed material are gender sensitive	Number of gender sensitive material produced
Partnerships with major stakeholders	Number of institutions and NGOs supporting MOSA

Gender Statistics and Rural Women

- Obstacles faced when assessing the position of rural women in Lebanon:

-Difficulty of defining rural areas because of the increasing overlap between "urbanization" and "ruralisation".

-Lack of accurate, detailed and up-to-date statistical data on the involvement of women in the agricultural sector.

- The economic activity rate of the total population of Lebanon (aged 15 and above) was 47.6% in 2009. (22.8% were women while 78.2 were men).

Source: Lebanon Official CEDAW report 2014, P.77.

- The table below shows the breakdown of workers by economic sector and sex.

Economic Sector	Men and Women together (%)	Men (%)	Women (%)
Agriculture	6.3	6.5	5.7
Industry	12.1	13.4	7.5
Construction	8.9	11.5	(less than 25 cases)
Commerce	27.0	28.7	21.5
Transport, post and telecommunication	6.8	8.4	1.4
Services	36.9	29.9	60.2
Finance and Insurance	2.0	1.6	3.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

- The income gap between men and women, by economic sector, is 21.0% in agriculture, 38.0% in the transport, post and telecommunications sector and a minimum of 6.2% in the service, finance and insurance sector. The income gap between men and women across all sectors is 6%.

Data on the status of women in the rural areas:

- According to a 2011 NOWARA study, rural women are employed in various sectors, as follows:

	Housewife	Agriculture	Education	Health	Artisanal	Private business	Outside village	Total
Percentages (%)	27.3	30.7	7.3	1.3	1.3	15.3	6.7	100

Women membership	Agriculture cooperatives	Political party or movement	Union	NGOs and charitable organizations	women's savings NGOs
Percentages (%)	4.7	6.0	2.7	12	11.3

- Women are employed in the agricultural sector as follows:
- Seasonal workers
- Entrepreneurs
- Members of a cooperative
- Family businesses.

- According to the recent study conducted by NOWARA in the southern regions of Lebanon, only 3% of interviewed women working in the agricultural sector state to have a regular work and a registered contract, women are often engaged just verbally.

- The Syrian crisis added up more challenges to agricultural workers such as:

- Difficulties in reaching the crops due to the tense situation

- Huge surplus of Syrian labor

- Closure of trade routes

Source: Elise Knutsen, "Syrian war reshapes agriculture in Lebanon", the Daily Star, 30 September 2014.

- Preliminary SWOT analysis for women in agriculture reveals the following:

Strengthens	Weaknesses
-Programs and budgets to finance national NGOs -Skills on psychological and social support to women in rural areas -Expertise on sustainable rural development and food security	-Lack of updated data after 2010 -Lack of data disaggregated by gender -Planning and communication between national and local level;
Opportunities	**Threats**
-Cooperation with Ministries, international organization, NGOs and municipalities -External funding/cooperation programs	-Political instability; -Lack of unified efforts. -Informality of the agricultural sector; -Unequal wage between men and Women

Agenda

1. Update on LCRP (WFP/FAO)

2. Gender mainstreaming and sex disaggregated data (FAO)

3. **Update on desk formula (WFP)**

4. WFP Update – 2016 (WFP)

5. Coordination of identified cases – strengthening of referral system

6. AOB

   a.   Introduction of New WFP Sector Coordinator

FOOD SECURITY SECTOR WORKING GROUP
FOOD ASSISTANCE TARGETING UPDATE

November 2015

WHAT
is the multi-sectoral joint targeting approach?

❑ Same Questionnaire

  ➢ HH profiling, interagency Quest. - Jan2015

❑ Joint HH visits

  ➢ Approx. 10,000 HH visits/month
  ➢ Over 100,000 families (90,000 HHs) visited (Nov 2015)

❑ Different eligibility formulas

  ➢ Data uploaded on UNHCR RAIS

HOW
is HH data analyzed for food assistance?

RESULTS OF HHs VISITS	
VULNERABILITY CATEGORY	%
Low	7.9%
Mild	8.9%
Moderate	16.1%
High	48.7%
Severe	18.4%

FOOD ASSISTANCE

❑ Eligibility based on vulnerability to food insecurity

❑ Global vulnerability score – 8 basic needs sector specific criteria (food security, shelter, WASH, education, health, non-food items, protection and socio-economic situation)

❑ WFP has removed 30,813 HHs (115,182 individuals) found not or less vulnerable from assistance through household visits as of Oct 2015

HOW
Is Food Score being revised?

❑ Stabilize caseload of most vulnerable – 2016 assist.

❑ Accelerate identification of most vulnerable HHs – increased vulnerability in 2015 vs.2014

❑ Cost efficient use of available data - 3 VASyR datasets and HH visits

❑ Develop and test a desk-based formula with support from AUB and in consultation with UNHCR and partners

❑ Use observable variables, community based info

❑ Operationalize desk-based formula in early 2016

WAY FORWARD

❑ **Convergence of targeting models - optimized complementarity of assistance**

➤ Cash Assistance

➤ Food Assistance

❑ **Review implications of applying new scoring formulas**

➤ Revised PMT

➤ Desk Based Formula

Agenda

1. Update on LCRP (WFP/FAO)

2. Gender mainstreaming and sex disaggregated data (FAO)

3. Update on desk formula (WFP)

4. **WFP Update – 2016 (WFP)**

5. **Coordination of identified cases – strengthening of referral system**

6. AOB

   a. Introduction of New WFP Sector Coordinator

Thank you