



Meeting			
Name	Information Management Working Group	Meeting Date	25/02/2015
Meeting Location	UNHCR, Lea Building	Meeting Time	10:00 A.M
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. Update from 3RP Regional M&E and IM workshop 2. ActivityInfo: Reporting, issues, how to include gateways in reporting 3. Static monthly/ quarterly dashboards 4. Latest admin datasets compiled by UNHCR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of Municipalities • Updated list of settlements (localities) Version 5 – links villages to municipalities • Cadastral to municipalities 5. Presentation of new Inter-Agency branding/ guidelines 6. Presentation of OpsFeed by WFP 7. Update from InfoRM Workshop 		

Summary of discussions and action points

1.	<p style="text-align: center;">Update from 3RP M&E and IM Workshop</p> <p>Overview: Wali Ahadi attended a regional 3RP and M&E workshop in Turkey. The key objectives were to establish minimum standards or benchmarks for regional reporting and to confirm processes for reporting, including monthly dashboard reporting amongst the different countries. Also, to generate ideas and actions for more in-depth dashboard reporting, with options to include resilience tracking, measurement and reporting, outcomes/ impact reporting and financial tracking for the both humanitarian and non-humanitarian components. Mapping of capacity and resources in countries and at regional support level were also undertaken during this workshop, to identify any gaps and hopefully identify some ways at addressing these gaps.</p> <p>Discussion: Some countries were using ActivityInfo as the primary reporting tool, whilst other countries are still using various excel spreadsheets and in-house tools. Discussions were around how to bring those countries up to speed, through possible adoption of the ActivityInfo system. A matrix has been established with all the indicators via the results framework, but there is a need to define how this data would be collected for use at a regional level. The matrix has been circulated among sector leads and is based on the LCRP. It was found that the resilience outcome indicators captured in Lebanon are weak, and that there is a greater need to separate indicators for resilience and stabilization. UNDP presented a paper on this in Cairo, and this will be shared among partners in due time. Online interactive dashboards were used in Jordan, and Max from UNDP also presented their online interactive dashboard for Lebanon. Aung Thu is also working on something similar from UNHCR. A need to harmonious these approaches are needed, and the teams will sit together to see which one of these dashboards will be used in the future in Lebanon.</p>
-----------	---

	<p>Plans are also in the pipeline in terms of how to present financial tracking per sector, in a dashboard format. There is a need to report on a monthly and quarterly basis how resilience funds and humanitarian funds have been spent by sector within countries.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A suggestion was made for a possible regional IMWG, to be held every two to three months, to better inform regional IM practices. - Comparison of UNDP and UNHCR online interactive dashboard will take place during this week (25/02/2015) and a decision to be made on which is the best way forward in presenting one standardized dashboard in Lebanon.
2.	<p>ActivityInfo Reporting</p>
	<p>Overview: Any issues regarding the use of ActivityInfo, whether technical or thematic, by partners and the group, were asked for during this session.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion was around gateways, what they are, how they defined, how they can reported on within the current ActivityInfo structure, and whether there is a need to change this based on the definition of gateways. A point was raised that addition to gateways, including the finding partner would also be a good attribute to include. There seemed to be confusion about who should be reporting, the donor, the implementing partner, or the subcontracting partners. In general though the implementing partner should be the one reporting, notwithstanding whether it is sub-contracting to local NGOs, as these NGOs might not have the capacity or infrastructure to report on activities. Lots of projects are being implemented through a specific process with municipalities – there needs to be a clear way of tracking who works with municipalities, not just who works within municipalities. It was unclear what classifies as a project with a municipality, as there are no set criteria for these, the same goes for SDC and PHC. One other issue was raised about the reporting in sites which do not yet exist. There are clear guidelines set-out about what to do in this case.</p> <p>Action Point: The definition of what a gateway is needs to be defined, and this will be taken back to the inter-sectoral team to ask them to clarify this better. Also, it would be good to know how many partners are sub-contracting out to local NGOs. Guidelines on how to deal with sites not defined within ActivityInfo can be found on the dataportal, and these can be circulated among partners again.</p>
3.	<p>Static monthly/ quarterly reporting</p>
	<p>Overview: The sector dashboard and LCRP was presented to the working group. It lists the achievements of sectors, based on ActivityInfo data and sector focal point inputs, and has been populated with end of January 2015 data. The reports have not yet been released.</p> <p>Discussion: The deadline for data submission is set for the 7th of every month, for the previous months' data. By the 15th of each month, the data would have been extracted and the dashboards populated by the sector/ IM focal point. Sector leads need to fill in a paragraph about the months achievements and challenges. Some flexibility are allowed on the dashboards, to allow sector focal points to include other type of information, not captured within the standard indicators already shown. However, the standard colors and layout remained the same for each dashboard and can't be changed. The LCRP dashboard will be updated by the JAU, who is not yet operational. By the 18th the final versions of the dashboards will be confirmed, and the sector dashboard (English version), will be released on the 20th, the LCRP on the 21st, and the Arabic version of both of these between the 21st and the 25th of every month.</p> <p>Action Points: Dashboards to be released today (25/02/2015), on the web-portal. How to include the different population groups, as these are not shown in the dashboards – however, it was noted that there is space available for sector leads to use/ show this kind of information.</p>

4.	<p>Latest Administrative Datasets compiled by UNHCR</p>
	<p>Overview: An up to date list of municipalities has been created by Maroun Sader from UNHCR. This defines which settlement belongs to which municipalities, and which cadasters are included in which municipalities. It should be noted that the dataset is not complete, as some villages could not be linked to any municipality, but it is hoped that this would improve with time. It is not a Lebanon Government product, but will be shared with the government, and can use by them, or also, potentially, make the government release whatever up to date information they have on municipalities. The exact GPS coordinates were added, courtesy of UNDP, through satellite imagery analysis.</p> <p>Discussion: UNDP is in the process of refining the municipal boundaries, and will eventually come up with a polygon dataset that would have split for which cadaster belongs to which municipality. The project will be made available soon, and has been compiled with information on refugee numbers and Lebanese population information. A need to use these lists in ODK was mentioned by IRC and Save the Children. Essentially, it would be good to have the PCODE available at the location you are undertaking your assessment, which would then define which village you're in, cadaster, municipality and district.</p> <p>Action Points: IRC and Save the Children were asked whether they could share what they are using now, in terms of cascading administrative hierarchy when using ODK in the field.</p>
5.	<p>New Inter-Agency Branding Guidelines</p>
	<p>Overview: The new branding guidelines were presented, which should be used for all products produced at inter-sectoral and inter-agency level. New working group logos and a new log was also introduced, and these should be used from now. The files can be shared in Illustrator or pdf form, but you can extract and save in png from from Illustrator.</p> <p>Action: The logos and symbols used can be made available in png format (or any other image format), which doesn't require the need of Illustrator. IM Beirut will make this available on the dataportal.</p>
6.	<p>Presentation on WFP OPSFeed</p>
	<p>Overview: The online interactive tool was developed based on a needs identified by the IM Food Sector groups. It contains relevant indicators, per activity for the sector and can be used to inform operational planning, help users visualize data and complement coordination activities. The data currently shown on the website is dummy data, and will eventually be replaced by actual data captured in ActivityInfo. Tabs identify active projects, planned projects, gaps and partners within the appeal. There will be an external version available which doesn't allow for the downloading of data, but can be used to visualize the information. The main idea is to find out what partners are planning on doing and where!</p> <p>Discussion: Planning data is captured at countrywide level, however, partners will be asked to provide planning data per month used to inform operational planning. Planning would relate to funded projects, not LCRP. There needs to be a clear definition in terms of what the GAP means, whether this operationally or in need.</p> <p>Action Points: WFP will be having a meeting next week Tuesday to present and discuss the way forward with this tool,</p>

	within the cash working group.
7.	Update on InfoRM Workshop
	<p>Overview:</p> <p>Discussion about the indicators used within this tool, for used in mapping a risk index for Lebanon. Discussion was facilitated by Mark and Richard. Lebanon is one of the pilot countries, to put together a risk index at district level. This has already been done at global level.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The components have been identified to provide the building blocks for the model. The next step would be to find the data that is needed to feed into this model. Two review cycles are planned to identify the information needed for the model.</p> <p>Action Points:</p> <p>Colleagues will be contacted bilaterally about data availability. You can check out the website at http://www.inform-index.org/ - which is the global risk index.</p>
8.	AOB
	Any issue that you want to add to the agenda for the next meeting should be made to Jad Ghosn. Also, the IMWG do not officially endorse products or tools used, but merely act as the facilitator making these tools accessible and available. Also, what the IMWG can endorse is not exactly clear.

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

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