



Minutes of NATIONAL INTER-SECTOR MEETING

3 August 2018, 10:00-12:00

Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA), Beirut

Chairperson(s)	Mario Abou Zeid – MoSA Margunn Indreboe Alshaikh – UNDP
Minutes Prepared by	Hiba Taha – UNHCR
Agenda of the Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General inter-sector update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Contingency plan b. Inter-Agency Referrals c. Research Questions d. Planning Process re-cap • Funding Overview and Discussion • Social Protection and the LCRP • A.O.B.

Summary of Discussions and Action Points

1. General inter-sector update:

a. Contingency plan

Key Presentation Points:

- The first Lebanon Inter-Agency contingency plan was produced in 2016, updated in 2017 and currently for 2019.
- The two key innovations for this year are i) the focus on operational preparedness and ii) the area-based plans as opposed to last year's sector-based plans. The final document will consist of four chapters, each pertaining to a region: Bekaa, South, North and BML.
- The timeline of the 2018 Contingency plan:
 - 25 June: Contingency Planning workshop
 - End of August: Regional contingency plans submitted
 - October: Completion of 2018-2019 Contingency Plan
- Three high risk scenarios were identified for 2019 during the workshop: i) violence in and around Palestine camps, ii) renewed conflict with Israel, iii) new refugee movements.
- The planning figures for each scenario:
 - Armed clashed in Palestinian camps: 182,200 people affected in case of suspension of UNRWA services and 75,000 in case of a deterioration of the security situation in Ain-El-Helweh;
 - Renewed conflict with Israel: 1 million people affected;
 - New refugee movements: 150,000 people affected;



- In order to formulate the regional level contingency plans, each region has to agree and submit planning figures, early warning indicators, the coordination structure to support the response, brief sectoral preparedness action plans and sectoral response frameworks.
- The next steps consist of formulating the regional level contingency plans by the end of August, updating the chapeau of the document and finalizing it by the end of October after circulation to HCT and the inter-sector team for clearance.

Key Discussion Points:

- The renewed conflict with Israel refers to the recurrence of a conflict similar to that of 2006, which would have massive repercussions, affecting close to a million people.
- The government is part of the contingency planning process, namely through the Disaster Risk Management unit (DRM). The coordination structures at field level involve the government and relevant national agencies. Eventually this plan is aimed at enhancing the humanitarian community's preparedness at supporting the government in case of an emergency.
- The Inter-communal violence scenario has not been identified as a high risk scenario after following the same methodology of assessing the impact and likelihood of it happening.
- It has been noted that the "Internal refugee movements within Lebanon triggered by municipal expulsions/restrictions" scenario falls under the current response capacity.
- It has been suggested to capitalize on the already existing Bekaa contingency plan, which has been used as a basis for developing the other regional plans.

Action Points:

- The second scenario to be amended to "Renewed **armed** conflict with Israel".

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link:
<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/65242>.

b. Inter-Agency Referrals

- All sector coordinators have submitted a one pager outlining the referral systems within their sectors, which are currently being reviewed and analyzed.
- Every sector has an agreed upon mechanism for referrals, the next step would be to harmonize the procedures across all sectors.
- The Social Stability sector coordinator from UNHCR, is currently working on the analysis of the results of the Inter-Agency referral tracking mechanism established within the Protection sector. On a quarterly basis, the results will be shared with the inter-sector on national and field levels.

Action Points:

- All sector leads to receive feedback concerning the referral systems adopted by their respective sectors, and standard elements required.

c. Research Questions



- The sectors have previously been asked to submit key questions –that they struggle with or are unable to address– specifically related to the humanitarian/development nexus, how the sector contributes to the overall impact of the LCRP and the sector strategy for 2019.
- The research questions collected from sectors are part of the efforts to strengthen data analysis and cross-sectoral linkages. They are meant to take stock of progress in terms of strategic direction and give an indication as to the priorities of each sector going forward by feeding into the 2019 planning process.
- The questions included in the document represent what is hoped to be addressed.
- The list of questions would inform researchers and university students who are interested in the response to contribute some way or another in answering them.
- It has been suggested to prioritize the questions for each sector and start thinking about potential programmatic changes.
- It is worth looking into research done in other contexts, outside Lebanon, that might be relevant to the response and the identified research questions.
- Concerning cash-based interventions, few impact evaluation studies have been conducted in Lebanon. It is unlikely that evaluation studies done in other contexts would be relevant given Lebanon’s unique experience with cash assistance.
- The document can potentially be updated on a rolling basis, whenever a question of interest arises or one needs to be removed.

Action Points:

- Sector coordinators who have not yet submitted the research questions for their sectors are kindly asked to do so, preferably before the next inter-sector.
- Develop a matrix/table, at the inter-sector level, that would summarize the scope, rationale (incl. programmatic implications), priority ranking, status and timeline. It could then be circulated amongst NGOs for further input.

d. Planning Process re-cap

- The Situation Analysis and Risk Assessment workshops have been postponed to the 5th and 6th of September. Both are multi-stakeholder workshops that will include among others, development actors and donors.
- Concerning the Human-centered design training, it will be given by an expert to all coordinators; the date to be decided later.
- The Risk Assessment workshop will replace the Planning Assumptions workshop that was conducted last year. It aims at addressing the operational and strategic challenges of the response. It is not expected from each sector to have a risk management framework, the objective is to rather discuss the commonly identified risks in the chapeau of the LCRP.

2. Funding Overview and Discussion

Key Presentation Points:

- This is the second funding update of the year, it covers the period from January to June 2018.



- 75 partners reported for the funding update of Q2 2018, a much higher number than the 45 who reported for Q1.
- Q2 2018 funding update:
 - \$918 million total funding received as of 30 June 2018, including carry-over/funding received in 2017.
 - Of the \$918 million, \$591 million are received in 2018 and \$327 million represent a carry-over from 2017.
 - Of the funding received in 2018 alone (\$591 million), \$451 million (76%) are for short-term projects and \$140 million (24%) are aimed at multi-year projects.
 - Multi-year project are defined as projects that span more than 24 months.
 - The top 10 donors in 2018 contributed to 92% of the funding received in 2018. The top three are the US, the EU and Germany.
 - The most funded sectors are Food Security (51%), Education (51%) and Protection (68%), the least funded are Energy (1%) and Shelter (17%).

Key Discussion Points:

- Some sector coordinators asked for additional information, namely who the top donors are per sector and the amount of funding per outcome; in other terms what is exactly being funded within each sector. However, the breakdown of funds per outcome is an exercise to be done on the sector level, if enough information is available concerning the donors and the projects, which is the case as a result of the funding update.
- It is difficult to breakdown exactly the funds of each project by sector and outcome.
- The budget for each sector includes the overhead, therefore the amounts and percentages reported through the funding update take the overhead into account.
- Sectors' input to the brainstorming session on the funding priorities and consequences of underfunding:
 - **Child Protection:** The first outcome on case management is not linked to funding.
 - **Health:** i) Flag the shortage of funding to outcome 2, which is Access to Secondary Health Care as many referred individuals cannot be supported and ii) at the end of March 2019, funds for a programme supporting 100 dialysis patients will be cut.
 - **Water:** i) Reduction in service provision for Informal Settlements (ISs) ii) the gap in funding is mainly due to stabilization projects rather than humanitarian interventions within the sector.
 - **SGBV:** Lack of specialized/complementary services like access to mental health or legal services.
 - **Shelter:** In general, the Shelter sector is one of the least funded sectors: 30% of the funds are directed toward humanitarian interventions, namely in ISs, and 70% are aimed at development projects for the rehabilitation of sub-standard residential Shelter units. Currently, the funds are equally allocated among both; only 55% and 17% of the required assistance in ISs and sub-standard residential shelter, respectively is provided. These figures show a huge gap in the response, particularly in relation to outcome 2 of the sector that addresses residential structures.
 - **Basic Assistance and Food Security:** The cash for food is included under the Food Security sector rather than the BA sector, which partly explains why the latter is only



18% funded. This number is low due to reporting issues by agencies who provide cash assistance. As a result, the BA sector does not rely on it to produce the situation analysis, it rather relies on targets and the total amount of USD injected in the economy in the form of cash assistance.

- **UNRWA:** The existing funds can only cover the cash for food and basic assistance programmes until the end of December 2018.
- **Education:** The Education sector is concerned about the upcoming Back to School campaign because of several elements in addition to the shortage of funding, as the transportation and books for students.
- The Health sector coordinator acknowledged that it is difficult to advocate for funds if the top donors per sector are not clearly known.

Action Points:

- The inter-sector team to have a discussion on the shift in donor strategy and its repercussions on the funding levels for each sector. It has been suggested to invite donors to the inter-sector meeting or request a presentation on donor strategies at the first multi-stakeholder planning workshop.
- The sector coordinators to go through the Q2 funding update results and clearly identify their priorities and the consequences of underfunding moving forward into the planning process for 2019.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link:
<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/65243>.

3. Social Protection and the LCRP

Key Presentation Points:

- Key definitions of social safety nets and social protection were agreed upon by the HCT Cash task force.
- Social Protection goes beyond basic humanitarian intervention, it bridges humanitarian and development actors together.
- Social safety nets are predictable and long term, combining cash and in-kind transfers as well as other collective services.
- Lebanon presents some legal, political and economic constraints that limit the full implementation of social protection programmes.
- Each sector within the LCRP tackles a different aspect of vulnerability through tailored interventions based on three targeting approaches: socio-economic, geographic and categorical.
- Profiling is the main starting point in order to understand the profile of the population being assisted, using existing targeting tools whereby vulnerability levels could be predicted, calculated or assessed.
- Social protection is aligned with the concept of Social Protection Floor, which represents under the LCRP, the cash and food assistance, Protection and emergency cash transfers and the access to basic WASH/ Shelter/ Health services.



- What is currently missing in order to implement a full social protection framework is the contributory component, which consists of the mandatory social insurance and social security benefits as well as the voluntary insurance.
- As a way forward, it is important to better align the targeting practices among sectors, identify gaps in the current services, design packages of services for different profiles and finally look at complementarity of assistance.

Key Discussion Points:

- Social Protection and support for social safety nets is a priority in the strategic planning of NGOs at the moment.

Action Points:

- It has been suggested to have a member of the Social Protection working group under the UNSF give a general update on the development side at the next inter-sector as well as a representative of the NPTP team.
- To check if the data on the poverty study conducted by UNDP could be used.

The presentation is accessible on the portal through this link:
<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/65241>.

4. A.O.B

- Concerning the upcoming LHF standard allocation, the consultation with sector coordinators will take place from 6 to 17 August. The draft of the allocation paper will be developed between 20 and 24 August; it will be circulated to the inter-sector for feedback between 27 and 31 August.
- Conflict Sensitivity training will be provided to sector coordinators and government counterparts of all four regions in September. The exact timeline along with further details will be communicated via email.
- The VASyR workshops were successful at validating the findings, but did not go as far as intended in terms of analysis. Bilateral meetings will be held between sector coordinators and Infopro to identify key findings and come up with programmatic recommendations. A presentation will be given to field offices and at the inter-sector meeting.