



**Inter-Agency  
Coordination**  
Lebanon

# Lebanon Crisis Response Plan (2017-2020) Monitoring and Evaluation System

## KEY UPDATES

Inter-sector WG, 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018

Jean-Charles Rouge, Inter-sector M&E specialist



**1** Key Evaluation Questions

---

**2** Monitoring framework of commitments made at Conferences

---

# 1 - KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS



- They are **high-level** questions that assess progress towards LCRP strategic objectives
- They help **focus** the LCRP M&E plan
- They help **structure** progress reports at both sector and inter-sector level
- They form the basis of data collection during implementation and in preparation of LCRP final evaluation
- At inter-sector level, the KEQ are organized under **three main categories**:

## APPROPRIATENESS

(relevance, fit for purpose, etc.)

## EFFECTIVENESS

(is the Response achieving the expected results)

## EFFICIENCY

(is the Response making the best use of the funding received)



## APPROPRIATENESS

(relevance, fit for  
purpose, etc.)

1. Is the structure currently in place fit for purpose and why?
2. Does the response create any space and opportunities for the Humanitarian/ Development nexus? Which ones?
3. Are target beneficiaries being reached as intended? Who are left behind and why?
4. What capacities are built within national institutions, communities, and at individual level?
5. How satisfied are the beneficiaries of assistance?



## EFFECTIVENESS

(is the Response  
achieving the  
expected results)

1. What were the changes in the socio-economic status of the people reached?
2. Has the response mitigated social tensions in Lebanon?
3. How duplication of activities are prevented?
4. What are the key elements of the response contributing to sustainability?
5. What innovation the response has triggered in service delivery systems, public policies?



## EFFICIENCY

(is the Response  
making the best  
use of the funding  
received)

1. How modalities used to fund the response impact it?
2. Is the response making the best use of available funding?

## 2 – MONITORING OF COMMITMENTS MADE AT INTL. CONFERENCES



Inter-Agency  
Coordination  
Lebanon

- Since London 2016, several international conferences on the Syrian crisis took place
- Donors and GoL made a number of commitments related to:
  - Funding
  - Protection
  - Livelihoods
  - Health
  - Education
  - Facilitating the work of NGOs
- These commitments are key assumptions in the LCRP M&E framework and need to be monitored – a commitment at risk of not being fulfilled can impact negatively the achievement of LCRP expected results.

- **Concrete policy commitments** agreed b/w GoL, EU and UN in Lebanon Partnership Paper (*run-up to conference saw policy / practice changes on residency, civil documentation*)
- **Health on the agenda** for first time (inc. WASH)
- **Groundwork laid for increasing accountability** for commitments
- **Civil society** 'meaningful role'
- **Drop in pledges** (\$6bn to \$4.5bn), including limited MYF
- **No concrete resettlement** commitments



### Partnership Paper:

- **Residency:** consider applying fee waiver to all refugees; point to challenges in processing / negative coping mechanisms
- **Civil doc:** consolidating recent changes to birth & marriage reg
- **Non-refoulement:** maintained 'red line' language from ISGL: 'safe, dignified non-coercive return to their country of origin'
- **Evictions:** useful language 'upholding rule of law so as to preserve the dignified stay of refugees'
- **Education:** focus on monitoring & transparency inc. tracking 'drop outs', progression and quality of education, publication numbers;
- inclusivity & learning, importance of NFE, TVET etc;
- **Health:** identification of challenges/priorities – accessibility, affordability, quality, hospitalization fees; recognition NGOs;

## Brussels II: **Highlights cont.**

---

- **WASH:** 'uninterrupted water, sanitation and hygiene interventions in ITS'; implement Water Code & waste management strategy
- **INGO Activity:** issuance of work permits, entry visa, residency permits & INGO registration in accordance with Lebanese law
- **Monitoring & accountability:** expand [financial] tracking system + M&E by LCRP steering ctte to ensure follow-up of commitments
- **Aid effectiveness:** review appropriateness/impact of response model
- **Multi-year funding:** maintenance of vague but supportive language

### **Missing:**

- **Livelihoods:** no specifics on improving access to employment for crisis-affected people/job creation; cut & paste from CEDRE
- **Other:** specific language PRS

## 2 – MONITORING OF COMMITMENTS MADE AT INTL CONFERENCES



- A monitoring framework will be developed:

### EXAMPLE 1 – FUNDING

Commitments	Benchmarks/ Milestones	Indicators	Baseline	Target (2020)	Means of verification
<p>Follow through on financial pledges and additional commitments for humanitarian and resilience support to communities affected by the Syria crisis, including flexible multi-year commitments</p> <p><i>Cf. Partnership paper Brussels II, point 26</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Quantity of funding:</b> timely disbursement of pledges reported through the Financial Tracking Service (FTS), aiming to fully fund the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan</li> <li>• <b>Multi-year commitments:</b> increase in pledges/ funding disbursements of more than 2 years to improve operational actors' ability to develop sustainable approaches to addressing vulnerabilities</li> </ul>	•	•	•	



- **Next steps:**
  - Conduct a series of thematic discussions, using the existing draft Monitoring framework as a starting point (linking each commitment to the new Partnership Paper and firming up SMART benchmarks, indicators, timeline, etc.)
  - Consultations will involve the inter-sector M&E specialist and IM, sector coordinators, most appropriate GoL counterparts, 2 NGO representatives (LNGO/INGO) and the EU