



IMWG Meeting Minutes			
Name	Information Management Working Group	Meeting Date	29/04/2015
Meeting Location	UNHCR North Sub-office, Tripoli	Meeting Time	12:30PM
Chair person	Wali Ahadi, Information Management Officer Jad Ghosn, Information Management Officer	Meeting Duration	2:00 hours
Minutes Prepared by	Adrian Combrinck, Associate IM Officer		
Purpose of Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presenting the IMWG revised ToR – <i>by UNHCR/OCHA</i> 2. Presenting the 3W Matrix and 2/3W maps – <i>by UNHCR</i> 3. Vulnerability Profiling in Collective Sites – Khaled Ismail, <i>by DRC</i> 4. Inter-Agency IM Products and Tools Draft - <i>by UNHCR</i> 5. Joint Analysis Unit – Survey on Usage of IA Tools – <i>by OCHA</i> 6. Population Package – <i>by UNICEF</i> 7. IM Priorities in the Field – <i>Open discussion</i> 8. AOB 		

Summary of discussions and action points

1.	<p>Presentation of the IMWG Revised ToR (OCHA)</p> <p>Overview: Revised ToR of the IMWG presented. <i>See document: Information Management Working Group –revised ToR March2015.doc. The document has been sent around for review already, with comments incorporated into this particular version.</i></p> <p>It was reiterated that the IMWG does not endorse any particular tool that is presented within these meetings. However, they can recommend these to the wider humanitarian community. As part of the IMWG revised ToR, a suggested to rotate the IMWG amongst the field offices were implied. The meeting in Tripoli is a first for the IMWG, and this will continue to rotate within other field offices.</p> <p>Discussion: The Collective Site Management and Coordination (CSMC) group does not currently sit within any particular working group. The question was raised as to how we incorporate tools created in this sector, and potentially other sectors, with the IMWG. It was mentioned that the IMWG is aware of the CSMC and is providing some technical guidance on usage of tools, at the national level. The IMWG does not share progress data, in terms of individual information, but instead makes products available at an aggregate level. An organization would still need a data sharing agreement between themselves and UNHCR if they want to have access to RAIS. This applies to having access to disaggregated information as well. The IMWG ToR doesn't specifically refer to the data sharing agreement; it should be seen as something separate. ActivityInfo is open to all partners as part of the reporting agreements.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TOR of the IMWG will be circulated once more to all Inter-Agency members.
-----------	---



2.	<p>Presenting the 3W Matrix and 2/3W maps (UNHCR)</p>
	<p>Overview: Inter-Agency products have been produced based on ActivityInfo data to cadaster level. The information is captured within a spreadsheet and can be updated on a monthly basis. It contains information on the vulnerable cadasters within a district, which sector and which organization works within a particular cadaster. The information will be uploaded on the web-portal very soon. Maps showing partners per caza were also presented, as a 2W tool, and these will also be put up on the web-portal. A website, called spongebase.org, has also been developed, where users can click on schools, informal settlements and municipalities, and pull data from ActivityInfo to show who has provided interventions. Everything is directly linked to updated systems (latest IAMP, latest AI data, etc...). You can search by names or pcodes, and then bring up multiple datasets of information. When you bring up the multiple datasets, you can also filter down the pieces of information by sector, keywords, etc... Multiple geographic levels are possible including informal settlements, schools, PHCs, Villages, etc...</p> <p>Action Point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Products need to be shared through web-portal and IMWG, and also through other working groups.
3.	<p>Vulnerability Profiling in Collective Sites (DRC)</p>
	<p>Overview: DRC presented their field assessment of 38 Collective Sites in Tripoli and its five surrounding districts. A collective site refers to informal settlements, collective shelters and buildings. The findings discussed perceptions by refugees interviewed during the assessment within these selected collective sites, but the information was also extrapolated to district level.</p> <p>Discussion: The methodology was not clearly defined or explained, and this should always be done before explaining the findings. Partners noted that you cannot extrapolate this information to district level, based on 38 collective site profiles. The sampling methodology should also be explain, not only for this assessment, but in general for every assessment done and presented by organisations. How to link assessments to geo-locations, should be explored, so that all partners could have access to their information, and at least know where and when assessments are taking place to avoid duplication and assist with coordination and joint-up approaches. There is an assessment working group, and partners were encouraged to make use of this. Also, on the web-portal there is a Needs Assessment Registry for partners to fill in their information about assessments that were done, or are planned.</p> <p>Action Points: The web-portal address needs to be shared with all IA members, and also the needs assessment registry and documents on how to use this. DRC will also need to share the TOR of their study so that IA members can have a better understanding of the methodology used within the study.</p> <p>Recommendation Link the ITS data with assessments data. (On spongebase?)</p>
4.	<p>Inter-Agency IM Products and Tools (UNHCR)</p>
	<p>Overview: A document outlining the main tools being used and recommended by the IMWG has been compiled and</p>



	<p>shared amongst all of those who attended the meeting. It is a collection of tools by the Inter-Agency.</p> <p>Action Point: This will be shared among IA members.</p>
5.	<p>JAU Survey of IM Tools used within the Inter-Agency (OCHA)</p> <p>Overview: The Joint Analysis Unit is formed as part of the requirements/ commitments of the LCRP. They have conducted a survey about the use of tools that are used throughout the IA. Currently the team consists of two members, Yannick Martin (OCHA) and Pauline Pascal(ACAPS). They are recruiting a GIS Analyst and Data Analysts in the following months. The objective of the survey was to get a snapshot of the kind of tools being used within the IA, and how communication and coordination can be improved among partners.</p> <p>Discussion: Partners asked why this was undertaken? Also, not everyone had access or even aware of the survey, so it should be good if they can do this again! A google doc has also been shared among partners to indicate which kind of tools they are using. This has not been filled in as much. Partners also mentioned that not everyone is receiving these emails. It was suggested to share the link to IA sign-up link will also be sent out again. This is usually included in most IMWG correspondence as a link.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Survey will be sent out again to all IA members. - The link of the google docs to be sent out to the working group and wider IA community. - A quick demo of how to sign up was also shown for all members.
6.	<p>Population Package (UNICEF)</p> <p>A population package was demonstrated by George Haddad. It combined all the public information available in different sources for Lebanon, and also the Syrian registered population data from UNHCR. Only the Syrian Refugee Population and the Informal Settlement Information are dynamic layers, as in they will change on a regular basis. All the other data on number of Lebanese have been gleaned from public sources like MOSA and other studies. All information has been compiled in one spreadsheet, for ease of use. Age disaggregation for district level information is also included.</p> <p>Action: The sheets will be put on the web-portal and send out by IMWG with the minutes.</p>
7.	<p>IM in the Field: Priorities and Needs (Open Discussion)</p> <p>Overview: Discussion about how IM is providing services within the field, whether there is disconnect to what is being provided and what is being used.</p> <p>Discussion: Partners requested reference/general overview maps in hard copies and focused on their area of intervention or governorate. It was affirmed they ae available and hard copies can be provided. Partners should also feel free to actually contact the IMWG within the field or at head-office to request maps or</p>



other information products. It needs to be a two-way communication channel.

A request for information on who works where, and their details were mentioned as a need, especially as in some areas, some organisations can't work, where other NGOs can. It would be good to have a list of where organisations are working.

Hotlines not being answered were also mentioned as an issue, since we are giving out hotline numbers, but some of these numbers are not being answered. However, most partners around the table mentioned that their hotlines are working, and if not, they should be notified. All hotline numbers are available for refugees, on the website refugees-lebanon.org.

A high need for the use of the referral section in RAIS. It will save the cumbersome task of following up on referrals in terms of checking various correspondence and different spreadsheets sent around between different partners. Solidarites mentioned that they would be happy to pilot the use of the referral system with another partner.

Prior notification of system downtime should be sent out to users, so that they can plan accordingly. The household data collection takes place regularly, and if data does not get uploaded due to technical issues with the server, it is unlikely that the partner would spot this in time.

GIS training was discussed, in terms of building the capacity of partners. There is a copyright issue with provided ESRI training using ESRI products.

Action:

Further investigation of whether training can take place and how this would happen.

Communication of the training plan for RAIS and ActivityInfo should be communicated in advance, so that organisations can plan to attend these sessions.

AOB

Vulnerability Mapping:

Overview:

An overview of the vulnerability mapping was demonstrated, with an explanation of the vulnerability index and new methodology used for calculating vulnerability, which takes into consideration of a Pressure Ratio, which is the ratio of refugees to number of Lebanese living there.

Discussion:

Pressure is not in all areas that have a lot of refugees, only in those which have few Lebanese compared to Syrians. This is flawed, but is the only available data.

Need to use qualitative methods for incorrect areas. However, these 251 cadasters cover 87% of refugees. UNDP suggests that the limitations just need to be made very clear, and laid out up front. This includes the issues of breaking down the vulnerability at the cadaster level. This is partly because of the non 1:1 relationship between cadasters and municipalities (upon which the Pressure index was conceived as a measure of pressure on services which are delivered mainly through municipalities). The information is also out of date and filled with many complex and different measures that are difficult to combine.

The UNRWA figure is from a survey 4 years ago, plus information on PRS. The map needs to include a date for the PRS figure.

Question about the rationale of moving away from the poverty line toward this index. It was based on recommendations from MOSA. The poverty divided the country into 8 groups, MDI is into 15, so is more refined. Also the MDI uses a multi-sector approach to vulnerability, not just socio-economic vulnerability. Comparison between the poverty and MDI show that the difference between them is pretty limited. Also the data source remains the same (2004 study by MOSA). Disaggregation should have been the same, since the information is from the same source. Unclear then why poverty could not just have been disaggregated at the same level, but point about multi-sector approach to vulnerability remains. Has there been any actual review of whether this is explaining the real vulnerability situation better than poverty? Yes, multiple



versions of this data were circulated, and the recommendation from the team as well as MOSA were to use the MDI and current vulnerability map.

Additional issue raised regarding using cadaster data that is taken through a non-representative sample. Most convincing argument (from UNDP) to use this data is that while there are possibilities of getting better data, doing so would skew data in ways that are unpredictable based on localized data conditions (i.e. how well the municipality keeps track of their information). The dataset used is a national dataset that has flaws, but has these flaws applied evenly across all of Lebanon without localized issues, which are much harder to understand and take into account.

Generally agreed that this is just a starting point. It's a living document and should not be considered final. Needs to be explained to donors in a cautionary note that direct targeting should not be based on this. So "Given the various data limitations, the recommendation is to use this as potential guidance, but there may be exceptions..."

Action Point:

Circulate minutes and the vulnerability map, and also a one-page explanation of the methodology for all IA members.

[Visit our Information Sharing Web Portal!](#)

Click here to [sign up to the Interagency Contact List for Lebanon!!](#)