Minutes of NATIONAL INTER-SECTOR MEETING
1 June 2018, 10:00-12:00
Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA), Beirut

Chairperson(s)	Margunn Indreboe Alshaikh – UNDP Mario Abou Zeid – MoSA Carol Ann Sparks – UNHCR
Minutes Prepared by	Hiba Taha – UNHCR
Agenda of the Meeting	• **VASyR Data Analysis Workshops** • **M&E Updates** • **Ark Analysis on the Impact of Assistance on Tensions** • **Contingency Planning** • **Funding Strategy– how could it be strengthened?**

Summary of Discussions and Action Points

1. **VASyR Data Analysis Workshops**

Key Presentation Points:
- The data analysis will start this coming Monday- the analysis of some chapters will be done by WFP, and the others by a private company, InfoPro. The data analysis for the VASyR will continue through July.
- This year, the Inter-Agency will organize 7 thematic workshops around the VASyR in an effort to strengthen data analysis and better inform the process by integrating recommendations from sector coordinators at national and field levels, and providing in-depth interpretation of the results.
- The workshops will be half day or a full day each, depending on the topic, from 9 to 20 July.
- InfoPro, sector core groups, sector coordinators from the field and the VASyR core group members will participate in the workshops. Sector leads/coordinators are invited to attend other thematic workshops as they deem relevant.
- The tentative schedule of the workshops:
  - ➢ Monday 9 July: **Basic Assistance and Economic Vulnerability**
  - ➢ Tuesday 10 July: **Food Security**
  - ➢ Wednesday 11 July: **Livelihoods**
  - ➢ Friday 13 July: **Protection/Child Protection/SGBV**
  - ➢ Tuesday 17 July: **Health/Nutrition and Child Health**
  - ➢ Wednesday 18 July: **Education**
  - ➢ Thursday 19 July: **Water/Shelter/Energy**

Key Discussion Points:
- The discussions that will take place during the workshops are meant to inform the planning process for the coming year.

- The data analysis will not be over after these workshops as there is room for more discussion with WFP and InfoPro to provide additional input and recommendations from sectors, which makes it an ongoing process.
- This exercise has the potential to tremendously improve inter-sectoral linkages and gaps within the LCRP. Any further cross-sectoral consultations post workshop would feed into the planning process of the LCRP.
- The type of data that sector coordinators will be provided prior to the workshops is critical to its success.
- The analysis plan has already been circulated to all sector coordinators to give feedback on the kind of analysis and linkages they would like to see in the VASyR. In addition, one week in advance, the tabulated data will be shared with the participants to prepare for the workshops.

Action Points:
- Add Social Stability workshop to be tentatively scheduled on June 12.
- This coming Monday, the VASyR core group will meet to discuss the detailed agenda of the workshops, so kindly share your suggestions/ideas with the Inter-Agency/IM concerning the planning of the sessions and the draft agenda.
- All sector coordinators to discuss with their respective core groups their expectations concerning the workshops' outcomes in order to come prepared and benefit from this opportunity.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/64259.

2. **M&E Updates:**

Key Presentation Points:

a) **Key Evaluation Questions:**
- The key evaluation questions aim at assessing the progress towards the LCRP strategic objectives while improving the structure of the progress reports at the sector and inter-sector levels. They inform data collection, particularly in preparation of the final LCRP evaluation.
- At the inter-sector level, the questions fall into three categories: appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency:
    - ➢ **Appropriateness** measures the relevance of the implemented programmes and seeks to evaluate whether the latter are fit for purpose;
    - ➢ **Effectiveness** measures the degree to which the desired outcomes/results have been achieved;
    - ➢ **Efficiency** aims at assessing the use of the available funding and limited resources-Is the response making the best use of the funding received?
- A list of questions falling under these three categories was developed based on sectors' research plans and research questions.

b) **Monitoring Framework of Brussels Commitments**
- Since the start of the Syrian crisis, a number of conferences (most recently Brussels II) have taken place in which governments and donors made pledges and commitments on funding, Protection, Livelihoods, Health and Education.

- These commitments are considered to be assumptions of the LCRP M&E framework; the achievement of the LCRP results is conditioned upon their fulfillment.
- NGOs have proposed that a monitoring framework and accountability mechanism be developed in order to better hold those making commitments to account to ensure the promises result in changes that positively impact vulnerable people.
- During Brussels Conference II, a number of positive commitments were made to improve the situation for vulnerable people in Lebanon. This included steps relating to protection (including regarding residency, civil documentation, language on non-refoulement; and respecting the rule of law); education (including focus on quality and increased monitoring); a focus on health for the first time in the international conferences (incl. accessibility, affordability and WASH provision); and facilitating the work of INGOs.
- Within the Partnership Paper that was developed by the GoL, the EU and the UN, in addition to concrete policy commitments, language was also included relating to improved monitoring and evaluation by the LCRP Steering Committee and strengthening the financial tracking system. Key areas missing from the paper included a missed opportunity to build on the CEDRE conference outcomes with a specific focus on access to employment/job creation for crisis-affected people, and no specific language on PRS.
- Notably, from the donor governments attending the conference, there was a significant drop in financial pledges, limited commitments to multi-year funding and a total absence of concrete resettlement commitments.
- Civil society held a meaningful role in the run-up to and during the conference itself, liaising with the Government of Lebanon (GoL) and the co-chairs (the EU and the UN).
- Moving forward, a monitoring framework is to be developed by the Inter-Sector team (ie. UN, GoL and NGO representatives) with the EU to propose to the LCRP Steering Committee - in an effort to improve the tracking of financial pledges and policy commitments.
- One way forward is to establish a tracking tool by setting a series of benchmarks and milestones as well as indicators and baselines for measurement, and agree on clear targets to be achieved by 2020 and the means of verification. This mechanism would be owned by the LCRP Steering Committee (SC) and embedded into the M&E framework of the LCRP.
- The next steps going forward include thematic discussions on funding, protection, education, livelihoods, health (including a WASH component) and NGOs work. These would comprise of the inter-sector IM, M&E specialist, sector coordinators, government focal points and an international and national NGO representative in each group.

Key Discussion Points:
- The proposed framework is to be potentially laid out to the LCRP-SC on the 3rd of July.
- These mechanisms and parameters have to be clear, simple and not too technical.
- Regional level funding commitments were made but these were not broken down by country – therefore it is difficult to track progress against pledges (to be discussed by the funding group).

Action Points:
- The proposed framework to be finalized and presented to the SC on the 3rd of July.
- Look at existing financial tracking system to strengthen it, especially around the tracking of multi-year commitments.

- Sector coordinators who have not sent yet their research plan and research / evaluation questions to the inter-sector team are required to do so.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/64260.

3. ARK analysis on the Impact of Assistance on Tensions

Key Presentation Points:
- The analysis of Wave III data from the perception survey seeks to measure the extent to which the provision of assistance affects the behavior and attitudes of the Lebanese toward Syrian refugees.
- These are the results of the third wave. Over 15,000 surveys were conducted over 3 waves in the past year.
- 85% of the Lebanese population lives in areas where the survey was conducted.
- The outcomes of interest are i) the refugee population pressure on services ii) the quality of relations and iii) the Propensity to Negative Collective Actions (PNCA).
- The main findings of the survey:
  - ➢ A greater refugee presence is associated with higher levels of Lebanese dissatisfaction if not offset by an adequate level of assistance;
  - ➢ Lebanese with lower income were more likely to evaluate the relations with displaced Syrians as negative;
  - ➢ Greater PNCA is driven by both real and perceived refugee population pressures;
- On average, greater assistance was associated with a lesser likelihood of negative outcomes.
- The findings suggest a positive indirect spillover effect of the provision of assistance on Lebanese perceptions.
- The Social Stability sector has a critical role to play in determining the effects of other forms of assistance provided, particularly so when combined with other forms of assistance.
- Negative Lebanese perception of the quality of relations is not necessarily associated with Lebanese vulnerability, it has to be considered with other social factors.

Key Discussion Points:
- The concentration of Syrian refugees is not the only factor to consider when looking at the negative perceptions of the quality of relations because a 1% point increase in the fraction of Syrian refugees in an area is associated with only 0.1% increase in negative assessment of the quality of relations.
- This study is taking the analysis one step further by examining the impact of assistance on social perceptions thereby feeding into the impact analysis of the LCRP as a whole; it is not directly feeding into tensions mapping.
- Regarding the impact of the different forms of assistance, notably the creation of jobs and employment opportunities had a sizable positive effect on Lebanese perceptions of tensions.

- Results on the district level are too broad to draw meaningful conclusions given the context differs widely on the cadaster level. Therefore having disaggregated data on the cadaster level would be a valuable addition to the study.
- The MoE has pointed out that the survey should examine more widely the impact of assistance on host communities.
- It has been noted that tensions are lower when Lebanese perceive assistance as fairer.
- The 1% and 0.1% percentage points mentioned in the context of the quality of relations are small when compared to other variables in the model, like the perception of the fairness of assistance.
- It has been noted that the language used is not accessible to everyone, and that there is value in highlighting the take-home message of the study. The Health sector coordinator acknowledged having difficulty in understanding how these results affect the assistance provision.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/64106.

4. **Contingency Planning**

   Key Presentation Points:
   - The objective of the contingency planning is to identify and assess the risks for the coming year, by leading UN agencies/NGOs. This is a yearly exercise since 2016.
   - Experts from several UN agencies and NGOs meet collectively to evaluate the potential risks on the basis of several contingency scenarios that are later validated by the Humanitarian Country
   - The timeline of the Lebanon Contingency Plan 2018-2019 is as follow:
     - ➢ 13 June: Validation of the process going forward at the HCT
     - ➢ 14 June: Preparatory meeting with groups' leads and co-leads.
     - ➢ 25 June: The Contingency Planning workshop will be held during which the final risk scenarios will be identified and agreed on.
     - ➢ The inter-sector coordinators will then reflect the necessary changes along with the updated planning figures in the 2018 Contingency Plan. A tentative inter-sector meeting to be held July 6.
     - ➢ 6 August: The sector coordinators to develop their respective sector's response plans after submitting their comments on the workshop outcomes.
     - ➢ At the end of August, the draft report to be finalized after being circulated to the inter-sector and the HCT for validation.

   Key Discussion Points:
   - The update of the Contingency Plan should look at further involvement from the government.
     - ➢ The government is welcome to participate fully in the process if focal points are designated.
     - ➢ The plan is discussed closely with DRM; they could potentially be more involved earlier in the process;

- It would be difficult to aggregate all the existing area-specific and agency-specific contingency plans given the differences in the planning figures. The HCT Contingency Plan would bring everyone together and harmonize one procedure based on the same figures, scenarios and early warning signs.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/64105.

5. **Funding Strategy – how could it be strengthened?**

   Key Discussion Points:
   - The comments on the Fundraising document included some criticisms: i) it covers different periods for each sector, which resulted from highlighting different priorities throughout the year, ii) it does not address cross-sectoral and multi-sectoral issues enough, iii) there is room to build in more regional content into it by highlighting regional gaps.
   - Sector coordinators were asked to provide feedback on the current structure of the Fundraising document and input on how to proceed with the prioritization of the sectors.
   - The document will be next updated in July. The inter-sector is constantly asked about the impact of the document, the funding strategy moving forward and how it could be improved.
   - The inter-sector should provide recommendations and advise on the funding priorities and gaps, with support from the Humanitarian Coordinator in prioritization.
   - The best way forward is for regional priorities/content to be feed through the sector coordinators at national level. The regional gaps could then be better highlighted in the process.